REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

GEN

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9495

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1872

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/methodistquarter5442meth

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1872.

VOLUME LIV.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXIV.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
NELSON & PHILLIPS.
CINCINNATI: HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1872.

121284

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LIV.

706208

JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

CONSERVATION, CORRELATION, AND ORIGIN OF THE PHYSICAL, VITAL, AND MENTAL FORCES. [First Article.] 5
J. S. Jewell, M.D., Professor of Anatomy in Chicago Medical College.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN AND ITS LITERATURE........ 40
Rev. Bostwick Hawley, D.D., Glen's Falls, N. Y.

THE APOCALYPSE A DRAMATIC ALLEGORY.......................... 54
Rev. A. C. Rose, North Granville, N. Y.

GERMAN EXPLORATIONS IN AFRICA.................................. 77
Professor William Wells, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

TWO SYSTEMS OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION......................... 94
Rev. William F. Warren, D.D., President of Boston Theological Seminary.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE SOUTHERN STATES. 103
Rev. L. C. Matlack, D.D., New Orleans.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 127

Foreign Religious Intelligence.. 145

Foreign Literary Intelligence.. 149

Quarterly Book-Table.. 152

APRIL NUMBER.

THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND. [First Article]... 181
Rev. D. Dorchester, A.M., Salem, Mass.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.... 194
Rev. J. T. Crane, D.D., Newark, N. J.

THE BIRTHPLACE OF JESUS, AND CHRONOLOGY OF HIS INFANCY. 216
Rev. Joseph Horner, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.

PROPOSED NEW ARTICLES OF RELIGION................................. 229
Rev. Alfred Brunson, D.D., Prairie Du Chien, Wis.

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION IN OUR CHURCH. [Second Article]....... 246
Rev. W. F. Warren, D.D., President of Boston Theological Seminary.

CHURCH EXTENSION.. 268
Rev. A. J. Kynett, D.D., Cor. Sec. of the Church Extension Society.

WORK FOR THE COMING GENERAL CONFERENCE.................... 295
Rev. Resin Sapp, Coldwater, Mich.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies.. 306

Foreign Religious Intelligence.. 326

Foreign Literary Intelligence.. 334

Quarterly Book-Table.. 83

JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

HOMER AND HIS ENGLISH TRANSLATORS. [First Article.]......... 357
Rev. Henry M. Baird, Ph.D., University of the City of New York.

RICHARD ROTHE 381
Rev. J. P. Lacroix, Professor in Ohio Wesleyan University.

THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND. [Second Article.]................................ 399
Rev. D. Dorchester, A.M., Lowell, Mass.

CONSERVATION, CORRELATION, AND ORIGIN OF THE PHYSICAL, VITAL, AND MENTAL FORCES. [Second Article.] 414
J. S. Jewell, M.D., Professor in Chicago Medical College.

IS GOD COGNIZABLE BY REASON? 442
Professor Alexander Winchell, University of Michigan.

THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA: ITS STATUS AND ITS FIELD......... 466
Edward W. Blyden, Professor in Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone, W. A.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 490

Foreign Religious Intelligence.............................. 503

Foreign Literary Intelligence................................ 506

Quarterly Book-Table.. 508

OCTOBER NUMBER.

PRESSENSE'S "MARTYRS AND APOLOGISTS"......................... 533
Rev. W. H. Withrow, Niagara, Canada.

WHAT IS THE FUTURE CONDITION OF THE WICKED? 546
Rev. W. S. Edwards, Baltimore, Md.

PETER CARTWRIGHT AND PREACHING IN THE WEST. [First Article].. 556
M. Cucheval-Clavigny. Translated from the French of Revue des Deux Mondes.

SIN... 578
Rev. R. H. Howard, Brookfield, Mass.

THE CHRISTIAN PASTORATE 587
Rev. W. R. Goodwin, D. D., Quincy, Ill.

PREVENTION AND REFORM OF JUVENILE CRIME..................... 601
Rev. B. K. Peirce, D.D., Boston.

HOMER AND HIS ENGLISH TRANSLATORS. [Second Article.]...... 619
Rev. Henry M. Baird, Ph.D., University of the City of New York.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies................................... 641

Foreign Religious Intelligence............................... 660

Foreign Literary Intelligence................................. 664

Quarterly Book-Table... 667

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW

JANUARY, 1872.

Art. I.—CONSERVATION, CORRELATION, AND ORIGIN OF THE PHYSICAL, VITAL, AND MENTAL FORCES.

Force and Matter. Empirico-Philosophical Studies, Intelligibly Rendered, with an Additional Introduction expressly written for the English Edition. By Dr. Louis Buchner. Edited from the last edition of "Kraft und Stoff." By J. Frederick Collingwood, F.R.L.S., F.R.S., etc. Pp. 271. London: Trübner & Co. 1870.

Les Phénomènes Physique de la Vie. Par J. Gavarret, Professeur de Physique a la Faculté de Médecine de Paris. Pp. 424. Paris: Victor Masson et fils. 1869.

Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews. By Thomas Henry Huxley, LL.D., F.R.S. Pp. 378. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

The Correlation and Conservation of Forces. A Series of Expositions. By Prof. Grove, Prof. Helmholtz, Dr. Mayer, Dr. Faraday, Prof. Liebig, and Dr. Carpenter. With an Introduction and brief Biographical Notices of the Chief Promoters of the New Views. By Edward L. Youmans, M.D. Pp. 438. New York: Appleton & Co. 1865.

Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion. By John Tyndall, F.R.S. New York: Appleton & Co. 1863.

Fragments of Science. By John Tyndall, LL.D., F.R.S. New York: Appleton & Co. 1871.

Protoplasm; or, Life, Matter, and Mind. 1870.

The Mystery of Life. By Lionel S. Beale, M.B., F.R.S., etc. 1871.

The Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces. By George F. Barker, M.D., Yale College. New Haven: Chatfield & Co. 1870.

Body and Mind. By Henry Maudsley, M.D., London. New York: Appleton & Co. 1871.

As Regards Protoplasm, etc. By James Hutchinson Stirling, LL.D., F.R.S., Edinburgh. Pp. 69. New Haven: Chatfield & Co. 1870.

Habit and Intelligence, in their Connection with the Laws of Matter and Force. By John J. Murphy. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1869.

First Principles. By Herbert Spencer. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

Principles of Biology. By Herbert Spencer. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

Psychology. By Herbert Spencer. 2 vols., (vol. i.) New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

Some of the most attractive and difficult questions claiming the attention alike of scientific and speculative minds at the present day, are indicated in the title of this paper.

Force, energy, or power, whatever it may be, yields the central conception out of which the questions referred to spring. It supplies a ground, and is a *datum*, required and used alike by the most materialistic among scientific workers and the most speculative. It is destined, as regards matters lying between physical and mental science, to be the ground of conciliation, perhaps of *re*conciliation. No *reality* occupies a more undisputed position than force. But few, if any, truths of its class are better established by all the might and main of science than its *immateriality*. It is *not* matter, and yet it has a *real* existence. It is no figment of the imagination. Besides this, in the principle of the *persistence* or *conservation* of force, is laid, so far as science can do it, the proof of its *indestructibility*.

In the discussion which follows we may safely assume the substantial, independent reality of matter as against the Idealist. On the other hand, once grant the *indestructible*, *immaterial something* called *force*, and *spirit* can take care of itself. Immaterial "entities" need be insisted on no longer. *One* is conceded, and, so far as it seems susceptible of proof by the methods of physical science, it is *proved*.

While the question more immediately before us is not the *correlation* and *conservation* of what are called physical and chemical forces, yet a brief historical *résumé* of the progress of research and opinion in this relation may prove useful. Whether to M. Seguin, or Count Rumford, or Dr. J. P. Joule, or Mayer of Heilbronn, or to others, science is most indebted, or who should have the credit of priority in the discovery of the nature and relations of the physical forces, are questions upon which it is not necessary for us to enter.

The discovery that may be fairly looked upon as introductory to the doctrine we are soon to state, was that announced by Count Rumford (Professor Thomson) in a paper to the *Royal Society of Great Britain* in 1798. Up to that time heat had been regarded as a subtle or fluid form of matter; but, as the result of rigorous experiments, he concluded it could not "possibly be a *material substance*." He says, "It appears to me to be difficult, if not impossible, to form any distinct idea of any thing capable of being excited or communicated in these experiments unless it be MOTION."—*Introduction to Youmans's Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, p. 33. Fifty years later Dr. J. P.

Force, energy, or power, whatever it may be, yields the central conception out of which the questions referred to spring. It supplies a ground, and is a datum, required and used alike by the most materialistic among scientific workers and the most speculative. It is destined, as regards matters lying between physical and mental science, to be the ground of conciliation, perhaps of reconciliation. No reality occupies a more undisputed position than force. But few, if any, truths of its class are better established by all the might and main of science than its immateriality. It is not matter, and yet it has a real existence. It is no figment of the imagination. Besides this, in the principle of the persistence or conservation of force, is laid, so far as science can do it, the proof of its indestructibility.

In the discussion which follows we may safely assume the substantial, independent reality of matter as against the Idealist. On the other hand, once grant the indestructible, immaterial something called force, and spirit can take care of itself. Immaterial "entities" need be insisted on no longer. One is conceded, and, so far as it seems susceptible of proof by the methods of physical science, it is proved.

While the question more immediately before us is not the correlation and conservation of what are called physical and chemical forces, yet a brief historical résumé of the progress of research and opinion in this relation may prove useful. Whether to M. Seguin, or Count Rumford, or Dr. J. P. Joule, or Mayer of Heilbronn, or to others, science is most indebted, or who should have the credit of priority in the discovery of the nature and relations of the physical forces, are questions upon which it is not necessary for us to enter.

The discovery that may be fairly looked upon as introductory to the doctrine we are soon to state, was that announced by Count Rumford (Professor Thomson) in a paper to the *Royal Society of Great Britain* in 1798. Up to that time heat had been regarded as a subtile or fluid form of matter; but, as the result of rigorous experiments, he concluded it could not "possibly be a *material substance*." He says, "It appears to me to be difficult, if not impossible, to form any distinct idea of any thing capable of being excited or communicated in these experiments unless it be *motion*."—*Introduction to Youmans's Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, p. 33. Fifty years later Dr. J. P.

Joule, of Manchester, England, proceeding on much the same line, established by a long series of delicate and elaborate experiments what is called the "heat unit," or "mechanical equivalent" of heat. By these latter experiments it was clearly determined that the force or energy represented by a weight of 772 pounds falling through a distance of one foot would produce, and could be made to produce, an amount of heat sufficient to raise the temperature of a pound of water one degree Fahrenheit. In this way it was shown that mechanical energy could be converted into heat, while the converse of this was established on a large scale in the discovery of the steam-engine.

The discovery by Oersted, that electrical can be converted into magnetic force, and the converse at a later day by Faraday, led the way to others, until in process of time the whole list of "imponderables" was drawn into the seemingly closed circle of correlation, as mutually convertible *inter se.* The history of the successive discoveries on which this brilliant generalization depended would be interesting, but it is aside from our present purpose to recite it. The results may be formulated as follows:

1. It is alike impossible to create or destroy physical force or energy.
2. Where force disappears in one form, it is only to reappear without increase or diminution in some other.

The *first* is called the *law of conservation*, the *second*, the *law of correlation*, of forces.

Examples might be easily given under both these laws, especially the latter, which would be full of interest; but they have been given already in so many ways to the public it is deemed unnecessary. But we may say with confidence, no facts in science so general in their nature seem to be better established than the *conservation* and *correlation* of forces.

But it could not be expected investigation would rest here. Questions similar to the following would inevitably arise: Since the various forms of physical and chemical force are mutually convertible, which form shall be selected as the representative or parent of the rest? Which shall be set down as primary, and which as derivative? In point of fact, as Mr. Grove says, (Youmans's "Conservation and Correlation of Forces," p. 185,) "The evolution of one force or mode

Joule, of Manchester, England, proceeding on much the same line, established by a long series of delicate and elaborate experiments what is called the "heat unit," or "mechanical equivalent" of heat. By these latter experiments it was clearly determined that the force or energy represented by a weight of 772 pounds falling through a distance of one foot would produce, and could be made to produce, an amount of heat sufficient to raise the temperature of a pound of water one degree Fahrenheit. In this way it was shown that mechanical energy could be converted into heat, while the converse of this was established on a large scale in the discovery of the steam-engine.

The discovery by Oersted, that electrical can be converted into magnetic force, and the converse also lately by Faraday, led the way to others, until in process of time the whole list of "imponderables" was drawn into the seemingly closed circle of correlation, as mutually convertible *vice versâ*. The history of the successive discoveries on which this brilliant generalization depended would be interesting, but it is aside from our present purpose to recite it. The results may be formulated as follows:

1. It is alike impossible to create or destroy physical force or energy.

2. Where force disappears in one form, it is only to reappear without increase or diminution in some other.

The *first* is called the *law of conservation*, the second, the *law of correlation*, of forces.

Examples might be easily given under both these laws, especially the latter, which would be full of interest; but they have been given already in so many ways to the public it is deemed unnecessary. But we may say with confidence, no facts in science so general in their nature seem to be better established than the conservation and correlation of forces.

But it could not be expected investigation would rest here. Questions similar to the following would inevitably arise: Since the various forms of physical and chemical force are mutually convertible, which form shall be selected as the representative or parent of the rest? Which shall be set down as primary, and which as derivative? In point of fact, as Mr. Grove says, (Youmans's "Conservation and Correlation of Forces," p. 189) "The evolution of one force or mode of force into another has induced many to regard all the different natural agencies as reducible to unity, and as resulting from one force, which is the efficient cause of all the others. Thus one author writes to prove that electricity is the cause of every change in matter; another, that chemical action is the cause of every thing; another, that heat is the universal cause, and so on."

Again, What is the source of these forces? From what *fountain* do they spring? What relation have they to matter? What are their relations to "life" and "mind?" Are the forces called "life force" and "mental force" independent of, and distinct from, the physical and chemical forces? or are they at root the same, differing only in modes or "conditions" of manifestation? If they acknowledge a common fountain head, where is it? Is it at this end of the series or that—physical, or mental, or intermediate? Are these forces simple or complex? As regards *vital* and *mental* forces, are they not *dynamic compounds*, similar to the living *material compounds* that compose the organisms of plants and animals?

In the case of plants and animals we often see elementary substances appropriated, ending with highly complex associations among them in the compounds of the living organisms. In process of time these, by natural analytic processes, are resolved back again into the primitive elements started with. Is not this true for forces as well? As *material physical elements* combine to form *living compounds*, may not *dynamical physical elements* also? Do not the former prefigure the latter? Materially speaking, "nothing passes into us but *matter*, and nothing passes out of us but *matter*, and nothing can be got from us after we are dead but *matter*, and this matter does not come *down* to us, but *up* from simpler, more elemental states below."

These elements and compounds enter our organisms freighted with energy or force. Does not all the energy of our bodies, even "vital" and "mental," slip in, and steal back this way? Are the differences between the physical and chemical forces, and the so-called "vital" and "mental" forces, any more marked than those which separate oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, and nitrogen from the protoplasm or muscle which they compose? Questions like these, many of them only deliberate con-of force into another has induced many to regard all the different natural agencies as reducible to unity, and as resulting from one force, which is the efficient cause of all the others. Thus one author wishes to prove that electricity is the cause of every change in matter; another, that chemical action is the cause of every thing; another, that heat is the universal cause, and so on."

Again, What is the source of these forces? From what fountain do they spring? What relation have they to matter? What are their relations to "life" and "mind"? Are the forces called "life force" and "mental force" independent of, and distinct from, the physical and chemical forces? or are they at root the same, differing only in modes or "conditions" of manifestation? If they acknowledge a common fountain head, where is it? Is it at this end of the series or that—physical, or mental, or intermediate? Are these forces simple or complex? As regards vital and mental forces, are they not dynamic compounds, similar to the living material compounds that compose the organisms of plants and animals?

In the case of plants and animals we often see elementary substances appropriated, uniting with highly complex associations among them in the compounds of the living organisms. In process of time these, by natural analytic processes, are resolved back again into the primitive elements started with. Is not this true for forces as well? As material physical elements combine to form living compounds, may not dynamical physical elements also? Do not the former prefigure the latter? Materially speaking, "nothing passes into us but matter, and nothing passes out of us but matter; and nothing can be got from us after we are dead but matter, and this matter does not come down to us, but sinks to simpler, more elemental states below."

These elements and compounds enter our organisms freighted with energy or force. Does not all the energy of our bodies, even "vital" and "mental," slip in and steal back this way? Are the differences between the physical and chemical forces, and the so-called "vital" and "mental" forces any more marked than those which separate oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, and nitrogen from the protoplasm or muscle which they compose? Questions like these, many of them only deliberate conclusions in the interrogative form, have come up, and have been variously answered. Some have affirmed that the physical, vital, and mental forces belong to distinct categories. Others have affirmed with various degrees of positiveness that they have a common origin, the special differences being but the masks that hide their oneness. Strip these away and they are seen, however widely they may differ phenomenally, to be but the varied play of the same primal energy. As matter in its elemental states, or simplest combinations in the physical world, is the great storehouse from which living beings draw the *materials* for the growth and development of their *organisms*, so in regard to the development and growth of their *forces*, whether "vital" or "mental." As the *simple dead matter* is elevated into *complex living matter*, so with the forces. This *material* development, or "evolution," which is always upward, never downward—from the simple to the complex—from the "homogeneous" to the "heterogeneous"—it is said aptly figures, is indeed a registry in material terms of what takes place among forces.

The *source*, then, of all the *forces*, as of the *matter*, of living beings, is the physical world—is *physical* force. This is the common and exhaustless treasury from which all forms of force, whether "vital" or "mental," are either directly or indirectly drawn. The particular *form* it exhibits depends wholly on the "conditions" under which it "works."

Here it is manifested in the microscopic fungus, there in the gigantic growths of our forests; here in the animalcule, there in the elephant or whale. Here it binds together by chemical attraction two invisible, simple atoms, to form an equally invisible compound atom of water; there it binds together the unnumbered millions of suns, planets, nebulæ, and systems throughout the fathomless profundities of space. Here it is manifested in the fall of an apple or a stone; in the ripple on a pond or a storm on the great deep; in the gentle breeze, in the hurricane, in the play of the golden willow in the wind, in the earthquake or the thunder-stroke; there in the repulsions of antipathy or hatred, or the attractions or "affinities" of friendship or of love. This latter is a favorite mode at present of answering the questions above raised. It is to this answer, in some of its phases and consequences, we desire to call attention in the following pages.

clusions in the heterogeneous form, have come up, and have been variously answered. Some have affirmed that the physical, vital, and mental forces belong to distinct categories. Others have affirmed with various degrees of positiveness that they have a common origin, the special differences being but the masks that hide their oneness. Strip these away and they are seen, however widely they may differ phenomenally, to be but the varied play of the same primal energy. As matter in its elemental states, or simplest combinations in the physical world, is the great storehouse from which living beings draw the materials for the growth and development of their organisms, so in regard to the development and growth of their *forces*, whether "vital" or "mental." As the simple dead matter is elevated into complex living matter, so with the forces. This *material* development, or "evolution," which is always upward, never downward—from the simple to the complex—from the "homogeneous" to the "heterogeneous"—it is said aptly figures, is indeed a replica in material terms of what takes place among forces.

The source, then, of all the forces, as of the matter, of living beings, is the physical world—is *physical* force. This is the common and exhaustless treasury from which all forms of force, whether "vital" or "mental," are either directly or indirectly drawn. The particular *form* it exhibits depends wholly on the "conditions" under which it "works."

Here it is manifested in the microscopic fungus, there in the gigantic growths of our forests; here in the animalcule, there in the elephant or whale. Here it binds together by chemical attraction two invisible, simple atoms, to form an equally invisible compound atom of water; there it binds together the unnumbered millions of suns, planets, nebulæ, and systems throughout the illimitable profundities of space. Here it is manifested in the fall of an apple or a meteor; in the ripple on a pond or a storm on the great deep; in the gentle breeze, in the hurricane, in the play of the golden willow in the wind, in the earthquake or the thunder-storm; there in the repulsions of antipathy or hatred, or the attractions or "affinities" of friendship or of love. The latter is a favorite mode at present of answering the questions above raised. It is to this answer, in some of its phases and consequences, we desire to call attention in the following pages.

That there are forms of force or energy called "vital" and "mental," at least as different from physical and chemical forces as these are from each other, there can be no real question. Accepting fully and heartily as a fact, the correlation of the physical and chemical forces, it is our intention to inquire what the grounds are for affirming the "vital" and "mental" forces are "correlated" with the physical and chemical. Two questions present themselves. *First*, Who holds to the opinion just referred to, and on what evidence does it rest? and, *second*, What is the *origin* of force?

The following are only specimens of the opinions, hopes, expectations, and imaginings of various persons, eminent in the walks of science, bearing on the subject in question.

Every particle of matter within the body obeys implicitly the laws of the chemical attractions. No overpowering or supernatural agency comes in to complicate their action, which is modified only by the action of the others. *Vitality, therefore, is the sum of the energies* of a living body, both potential and actual.—*Barker*, pp. 14, 15. . . . The most *advanced thinkers* in science of to-day, therefore, look upon the *life* of the living form as inseparable from its *substance*, and believe that the former is *purely phenomenal*, and *only a manifestation* of the latter.—*Barker*, p. 5, *et seq.*

Heat, light, chemical affinity, etc., are alike transformable into each other and into those *modes* of the *unknowable* which we distinguish as sensation, emotion, thought. These in their turn being directly or indirectly retransformable into the original shapes.—*Spencer*, *F. P.*, p. 280. . . . Any hesitation to admit that between the *physical forces* and the *sensations* there *is a correlation* like that between the *physical forces themselves*, must disappear on remembering how the one correlation, like the other, is not *qualitative* but *quantitative*. . . . Besides the *correlation* and *equivalence* between *external physical forces* and the *mental forces generated by them* in us under the *form* of *sensations*, there is a correlation and equivalence between *sensations* and those *physical forces* which, in the shape of bodily actions, result from them.—*Spencer*, *F. P.*, p. 275. . . . That no *idea* arises, save as a *result* of some *physical force expended in producing it*, is fast becoming a common-place in science, and whoever will duly *weigh the evidence* will see that *nothing but an overwhelming bias* in favor of a preconceived theory can explain its non-acceptance.—*Spencer*, *F. P.*, p. 280.

That these forces (mechanical, thermal, luminous, electric, chemical, nervous, sensory, emotional, and intellectual) are *perfectly co-ordinated*—that there is some definite relation among them which explains the marvelous dynamic unity of the living organism—does not admit of question.—*Youmans*, *Introd.*, xxxii.

I hold, with the materialist, that the *human* body, like all *living*

That there are forms of force or energy called "vital" and "mental," at least as different from physical and chemical forces as these are from each other, there can be no real question. Accepting fully and heartily as a fact, the correlation of the physical and chemical forces, it is our intention to inquire what the grounds are for affirming the "vital" and "mental" forces are "correlated" with the physical and chemical. Two questions present themselves. *First*, Who holds to the opinion just referred to, and on what evidence does it rest? and, *second*, What is the origin of force?

The following are only specimens of the opinions, hopes, expectations, and imaginings of various persons, eminent in the walks of science, bearing on the subject in question.

Every particle of matter within the body obeys implicitly the laws of the chemical attractions. No overpowering or supernatural agency comes in to complicate their action, which is modified only by the action of the others. *Vitality, therefore, is the sum of the energies of a living body, both potential and actual.*—*Barker*, pp. 14, 15. . . . The most advanced *thinkers* in science of to-day, therefore, look upon the *life* of the living form as inseparable from its substance, and believe that the former is *purely phenomenal, and only a manifestation* of the latter.—*Barker*, p. 3, *et seq.*

Heat, light, chemical affinity, etc., are alike transformable into each other and into those *modes* of the *unknowable* which we distinguish as sensation, emotion, thought. These in their turn being directly or indirectly retransformable into the original shapes.—*Spencer, F. P.*, p. 280. . . . Any hesitation to admit that between the *physical forces* and the *sensations* there is a *correlation* like that between the *physical forces themselves*, must disappear on remembering how the one correlation, like the other, is not qualitative but quantitative. . . . Besides the correlation and equivalence between *external physical forces* and the *mental forces generated by them* in us under the *form* of sensations, there is a correlation and equivalence between sensations and those *physical forces* which, in the shape of bodily actions, result from them.—*Spencer, F. P.*, p. 258. . . . That no idea arises, save as a result of some *physical force expended in producing it*, is fast becoming a common-place in science, and whoever will duly *weigh the evidence will see that nothing but an overwhelming bias* in favor of a preconceived theory can explain its non-acceptance.—*Spencer, F. P.*, p. 281.

That these forces (mechanical, thermal, luminous, electric, chemical, nervous, sensory, emotional, and intellectual) are *definitely co-ordinated*—that there is some definite relation among them, which explains the marvelous dynamic unity of the living organism—does not admit of question.—*Youmans, Introd.* xxxii.

I hold, with the materialist, that the *human body*, like all living *bodies, is a machine, all* the operations of which will, sooner or later, be explained on physical principles. I believe that we shall, *sooner or later*, arrive at a *mechanical equivalent* of *consciousness*, just as we have arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat.—*Huxley*, p. 339.

Old and new vitalism finds its center in the theory of a *vital force.* This doctrine has, in Germany, passed through so many critical ordeals that it has almost passed from the mouth of the *scholar.— Virchow.* (*Büchner.*) . . . Of vital force, in the mechanical sense in which I take it, I have *no doubt* that it *must be* considered as the *result* of a definite *joint action* of *physical and chemical forces.* — *Virchow*, (*Büchner*,) Pref. to fourth ed., p. 49.

Those who preach the *error* of a *vital power under any form or delusive disguise* are, they may *rest assured*, heads which have *never*, penetrated the gates of science.—*Du Bois Reymond* (*Büchner*,) Pref. to fourth ed., p. 48.

What is called *vitality* is not a *peculiar force*, but a *collocation* of the forces of *organic matter* in such a way as to keep up a *living structure.—Bain: Senses and Intellect*, p. 65.

You see I am not mincing matters, but avowing nakedly what *many scientific thinkers* more or less distinctly believe. The formation of a crystal, a plant, or an animal, is in their eyes a *purely mechanical* problem, which differs from the problems of ordinary mechanics in the smallness of the masses and the complexity of the processes involved. . . . Our difficulty is not with the *quality* of the problem, but with its complexity. This difficulty might be met by the simple expansion of the faculties which we now possess. Given this expansion and the necessary molecular data, and the chick might be deduced, as rigorously and as logically from the egg, as the existence of Neptune from the disturbances of Uranus, or as conical refraction from the undulatory theory of light.—*Tyndall, F. of S.*, p. 118. . . . The building up of the vegetable, then, *is effected by the sun* through the reduction of chemical compounds. *The phenomena of animal life are more or less complicated reversals of these processes of reduction.* (Italics his own.) . . . Life is a *wave* which in no two consecutive moments of its existence is composed of the same particles.—*Tyndall, F. of S.*, p. 414, *Vitality.*

Life itself is nothing but the product of the conjoined action of these forces, (physical forces.)—*Büchner*, p. 216. . . . For the naturalist proves that there are no other forces in nature besides the physical, chemical, and mechanical; and infers irresistibly that the organisms must also have been produced by these forces.—*Büchner*, Pref. to third ed., p. 27.

To these passages dozens more might be added from various writers, equally explicit. They would all go to show unmistakably what are the deliberate opinions of various prominent laborers, and we may say *leaders*, in the domain of physical and natural science. Besides these, there is reason to think bodies, *is a machine, all the operations of which will, sooner or later, be explained on physical principles.* I believe that we shall, sooner or later, arrive at a *mechanical equivalent of consciousness*, just as we have arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat.—*Huxley*, p. 335.

Old and new vitalism finds its center in the theory of a *vital force*. This doctrine has, in Germany, passed through so many critical ordeals that it has almost passed from the mouth of the people.—*Virchow*, (*Büchner*,) . . . Of vital force, in the mechanical sense in which I take it, I have no doubt that it must be considered as the *result* of a definite *joint action of physical and chemical forces*.—*Virchow*, (*Büchner*,) Pref. to fourth ed., p. 49.

Those who preach the error of a *vital power* under any form or delusive disguise are, they may rest assured, heads which have never penetrated the general science.—*Du Bois Reymond* (*Büchner*,) Pref. to fourth ed., p. 12.

What is called vitality is not a peculiar force, but a collocation of the forces of organic matter in such a way as to keep up a living structure.—*Bain: Senses and Intellect*, p. 65.

You see I am not mincing matters, but avowing nakedly what many *scientific thinkers* more or less distinctly believe. 'The formation of a crystal, a plant, or an animal, is in their eyes purely a mechanical problem, which differs from the problems of ordinary mechanics in the smallness of the masses and the complexity of the processes involved. . . . Our difficulty is not with the *quality* of the problem, but with its *complexity*. This difficulty might be met by the simple expansion of the faculties which we now possess. Given this expansion and the necessary molecular data, and the chick might be deduced, as rigorously and as logically from the egg, as the existence of Neptune from the disturbances of Uranus, or as conical refraction from the undulatory theory of light.—*Tyndall, Frag'ts*, p. 118. . . . The building up of the vegetable, then, *is effected by the sun through the reduction of chemical compounds. The phenomena of animal life are more or less complicated reversals of these processes of reduction.* (Italics his own.) . . . Life is a wave which in no two consecutive moments of its existence is composed of the same particles.—*Tyndall, Frag'ts*, p. 114, Huxley.

Life itself is nothing but the product of the combined action of these forces, (physical forces.)—*Büchner*, p. 276. . . . For the naturalist proves that there are no other forces in nature besides the physical, chemical, and mechanical; and infers irresistibly that the organisms must also have been produced by these forces.—*Büchner*, Pref. to third ed., p. 77.

To these passages dozens more might be added from various writers, equally explicit. They would all go to show unmistakably what are the deliberate opinions of various prominent laborers, and we may say leaders, in the domain of physical and natural science. Besides these, there is reason to think very many of the now prominent physicists, chemists, and naturalists in our own country (certainly in Europe) who have not publicly expressed themselves, share in various degrees the opinions set forth in the above extracts. Beyond this they are now held by no inconsiderable proportion of our scientific students, and by many among our reading public, who are captivated by the somewhat novel and sweeping doctrines announced concerning the relations of forces, and also by the chivalrous, confident attitude assumed by some of the promulgators of the same, and the splendor of their talents and achievements. Most often such as belong to the latter classes do not possess the means for verifying the assertions they receive, although in receiving them they may be led to important practical consequences. From such statements as we have quoted we may conveniently deduce the following propositions as fairly embodying their meaning:

1. The various forms of force called *physical* and *chemical*, are capable of *mutual conversion.* Any one form may be converted into any or all the others, and *vice versa.*

2. The peculiar phenomena exhibited by living beings, usually called *vital* and *mental*, instead of being due to special forms of force or power, as hitherto supposed, are really due to certain *combinations* or *conversions* of the *physical* and *chemical* forces. Indeed, in the same manner as the *physical* and *chemical* forces are converted *inter se*, so are the *physical*, *vital*, and *mental.* Heat, for example, may be converted into mechanical energy, or mechanical force back again into heat. Or heat may be transformed into what has been called "vital" or "life" force, and "mental" or "will" force, and these in their turn directly or indirectly back again into heat or mechanical energy. It is heat at this moment and "will force" the next, and *vice versa;* and might be "*chemical* attraction" or force here and "*conjugal* attraction" or force there, etc.

3. As regards the ORIGIN of forces, the physical forces yield both the warp and woof of all the others, however widely they may differ in pattern—all the way through the entire series—from physical up to mental forces.

We believe these propositions to state fairly the doctrines to which we refer. As regards the *first* we gladly assent to it, not only as true, but fruitful. But of the *second* and *third* we

do not feel so certain. Yet when there are so many confident assertions by men so able and worthy our confidence and respect, it must be presumed there are some good grounds for them. This presumption becomes all the more impressive when it is remembered the statements in question are made by men who, of all others, stick most closely to the "facts." They test every theory or proposition by the touchstone of rigid "scientific method." "The strength of *their* proofs lies in *facts*, not in unintelligible and empty phrases."—*Büchner*, Pref. to first ed., xviii. They always inquire concerning every fact or proposition, according to Professor Huxley, in the language used by Hume in one of his Essays, (*Essays*, vol. ii, p. 175, London, 1777:) "Does it contain any reasoning concerning *quantity* or number? No. Does it contain any *experimental* reasoning concerning *matter*, *effect*, and *existence?* No. Commit it, then, to the flames, for it can contain *nothing* but *sophistry* and *illusion*."—*Huxley*, *Lay Sermons*, p. 145.

Up to this judgment bar they bring every fact, generalization, or proposition; and if it cannot satisfy the demands and abide the tests of "scientific" justice, without fear, favor, or prejudice, the sentence of the utterly condemned is meted out to it. The proofs of the propositions above drawn out are so cogent and complete that no "educated," much less a "scientific," man can doubt them. The one who refuses to fall into the line along which every body that is "intelligent" and "unprejudiced" is moving, must remain, perforce, in outer darkness. For whatever his fancies may be, he "may rest assured" his is one of the "heads which have never penetrated the gates of science." In short "nothing but an overwhelming bias in favor of a preconceived theory can explain their non-acceptance."

Notwithstanding all this we have thought it good to examine the evidence, at least so much of it as we have met with, on which these modern doctrines in regard to force rest. The importance of their consequences is such as to render an examination imperative on the part of every one who would receive them intelligently, and be able to render a reason for the faith that is in him.

Before beginning an examination of the evidence in question, there is a preliminary duty that must be discharged. We do not feel so certain. Yet when there are so many confident assertions by men so able and worthy our confidence and respect, it must be presumed there are some good grounds for them. This presumption becomes all the more impressive when it is remembered the statements in question are made by men who, of all others, stick most closely to the "facts." They test every theory or proposition by the touchstone of rigid "scientific method." "The strength of these proofs lies in facts, not in unintelligible and empty phrases."—*Büchner*, Pref. to first ed., xviii. They always inquire concerning every fact or proposition, according to Professor Huxley, in the language used by Hume in one of his Essays, (Essays, vol. ii, p. 175, London, 1777.) "Does it contain any reasoning concerning quantity or number? No. Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter, effect, and existence? No. Commit it, then, to the flames, for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion."—*Huxley, Lay Sermons*, p. 143.

Up to this judgment bar they bring every fact, generalization, or proposition; and if it cannot satisfy the demands and abide the tests of "scientific" parties, whatsoever, fate, or prejudice, the sentence of the utterly condemned is meted out to it. The proofs of the propositions above drawn out are so cogent and complete that no "educated," much less "scientific," man can doubt them. The one who refuses to fall into the line along which every body that is "intelligent" and "unprejudiced" is moving, must remain, perforce, in outer darkness. For whatever his reasons may be, he "may not, needed" his is one of the "heads which have never penetrated the gates of science." In short, "nothing but an overwhelming bias in favor of a preconceived theory can explain their non-acceptance."

Notwithstanding all this we have thought it good to examine the evidence, at least so much of it as we have met with, on which these modern doctrines in regard to force rest. The importance of their consequences is such as to render an examination imperative on the part of every one who would receive them intelligently, and be able to render a reason for the faith that is in him.

Before beginning an examination of the evidence in question, there is a preliminary duty that must be discharged. We have already met with some terms, and will soon meet with others, that need definition. As Mr. Spencer says, adopting an old logical maxim, "There can be no sound philosophy without clearly defined terms."—*F. P.*, p. 223. The necessity for this in the present case will be quite manifest as we proceed.

In the few brief definitions we seek to obtain in starting, we must pass by such terms and phrases as "life," "vitality," "organic," "organized," "protoplasm," "phenomenon," "cause," etc., and in particular those that are less familiar, but more formidable looking, such as "unknowable," "unknown cause," "catalytic force," "*dynamic* force," "subtle influences," "mysterious agencies," "cell *laboratories*," "molecular *machinery*," etc., that play in and out so freely in the language of modern physics. We must confess we are too far behind to understand some of these things—for example, "subtle influences" and "molecular machinery." They convey to our minds only a vague notion of the means and results of the strifes and conquests that are taking place among the "advanced."

Our task will be the more humble one of trying to find out, if we can, the provisional meaning of the word "*force*," and perhaps of a few of the correlative or dependent terms that cluster about it, such as "energy," "motion," "conservation," "correlation," etc.

I. CONSERVATION. "The invariability of the absolute amount in the midst of constant change is called the *conservation of force*." —*Le Conte*, p. 187.* "And why should a perpetual motion, even under modern conditions, be impossible? The answer to this question is, the statement of that great generalization of modern science which is known under the name of *conservation of energy*. This principle asserts that no power can make its appearance in nature without an equivalent expenditure of some other power; that natural agents are so related to each other as to be mutually convertible, but that no new agency is created. Light runs into heat, heat into electricity, electricity into magnetism, magnetism into mechanical force, and mechanical force again into light and heat. The Proteus changes, but he is ever the same; and his changes in nature, *supposing* no miracle to supervene, are the expression not of spontaneity, but of *physical necessity*."—*Tyndall, F. of S.*, p. 38.

In other words, force is never lost or destroyed; it is indestructible. Though it may disappear in this form, it is only to have already met with some terms, and will soon meet with others, that need definition. As Mr. Spencer says, adopting an old logical maxim, "There can be no sound philosophy without clearly defined terms."—*F. P.*, p. 228. The necessity for this in the present case will be quite manifest as we proceed.

---

* Proceedings of American Association for Advancement of Science, Meeting August, 1859. 1860.

In the few brief definitions we seek to obtain in starting, we must pass by such terms and phrases as "life," "vitality," "organic," "organized," "protoplasm," "phenomenon," "cause," etc., and in particular those that are less familiar, but more formidable looking, such as "unknowable," "unknown cause," "catalytic force," "*dynamic* force," "subtle influences," "mysterious agencies," "*cell laboratories*," "molecular machinery," etc., that play in and out so freely in the language of modern physics. We must confess we are too far behind to understand some of these things—for example, "subtle influences" and "molecular machinery." They convey to our minds only a vague notion of the means and results of the strifes and conquests that are taking place among the "advanced."

Our task will be the more humble one of trying to find out, if we can, the provisional meaning of the word "*force*," and perhaps of a few of the correlative or dependent terms that cluster about it, such as "energy," "motion," "conservation," "correlation," etc.

I. Conservation. "The invariability of the absolute amount in the midst of constant change is called the *conservation of force*."—*Le Conte*, p. 187.* "And why should a perpetual motion, even under modern conditions, be impossible? The answer to this question is, the statement of that great generalization of modern science which is known under the name of *conservation of energy*. This principle asserts that no power can make its appearance in nature without an equivalent expenditure of some other power; that natural agents are so related to each other as to be mutually convertible, but that no new energy is created. Light runs into heat, heat into electricity, electricity into magnetism, magnetism into mechanical force, and mechanical force again into light and heat. The Proteus changes, but he is ever the same; and his changes in nature, supposing no miracle to supervene, are the expression, not of spontaneity, but of *physical necessity*."—*Tyndall, F. of S.*, p. 38.

In other words, *force* is never lost or destroyed; it is indestructible. Though it may disappear in this form, it is only to reappear in some other. In this respect it strictly follows the example of matter, which, though its sensible state or shape may be changed, continues in elementary nature the same, and is indestructible.

---

* Proceedings of American Association for Advancement of Science, Meeting August, 1859. 1860.

II. CORRELATION. "The mutual convertibility of the various forms of force is called *correlation* of forces."—*Le Conte*, p. 187. The word "correlation means a necessary or reciprocal dependence of two ideas, inseparable even in mental conception."—*Grove*, p. 183.

It affirms of things said to be correlated a relation so intimate we cannot even conceive them apart. Or, again, Mr. Grove says, in agreement with the above, "It means *necessary reciprocal reproduction*." Says Prof. Tyndall:

> The convertibility of natural forces consists solely in the transformations of dynamic into potential, and of potential into dynamic energy, which are incessantly going on. In no other sense has the convertibility of force at present any scientific meaning.—*Tyndall*, *F. of S.*, p. 31, *Barker*.

And so we might adduce the definitions of various other writers if it were necessary. We desire, however, to call strict attention to the meaning of this term, since it is a leading one in the discussion upon which we are entering. Forces said to be correlated are understood to be capable of complete conversion or transformation, the one into the other, and *vice versa*—this wholly into that, that wholly into this. Forces, or portions of them, if we may so speak, between which such interchange cannot take place, are not *correlated.* But no such thing as reservation of *part* of a force from *possible* conversion, when another part has undergone *actual* conversion, can be admitted for a moment. As Mr. Grove says, it means "*necessary* mutual reproduction," and nothing less. Consequently, when we speak of the *physical* and *chemical* forces on this hand, and the "vital" and "mental" on that, as being *correlated*, we mean that *heat*, for example, may be converted into *life force* or *mind force*, and that *mind force* and *life force* are wholly convertible into *heat.* It is this or nothing. If "life force" or "mental force" are *partially* surrendered to conversion, we must surrender all. And it does not matter whether the conversion is direct or indirect, only so the *fact* be admitted ultimately. This strict meaning, which is in fact the only legitimate one the word has in the present reappear in some other. In this respect it strictly follows the example of matter, which, though its sensible state or shape may be changed, continues in elementary nature the same, and is indestructible.

II. CORRELATION. "The mutual convertibility of the various forms of force is called correlation of forces."—*Le Conte*, p. 171. The word "correlation means a necessary or reciprocal dependence of two ideas, inseparable even in mental conception."—*Grove*, p. 152.

It affirms of things said to be correlated a relation so intimate we cannot even conceive them apart. Or, again, Mr. Grove says, in agreement with the above, "It means *necessary reciprocal reproduction*." Says Prof. Tyndall:

> The convertibility of natural forces consists solely in the transformations of dynamic into potential, and of potential into dynamic energy, which are incessantly going on. In no other sense has the convertibility of force at present any scientific meaning.—*Tyndall, F. of S.*, p. 31, *Barker*.

And so we might adduce the definitions of various other writers if it were necessary. We desire, however, to call strict attention to the meaning of this term, since it is a leading one in the discussion upon which we are entering. Forces said to be correlated are understood to be capable of complete conversion or transformation, the one into the other, and *vice versa*—this wholly into that, that wholly into this. Forces, or portions of them, if we may so speak, between which such interchange cannot take place, are not correlated. But no such thing as reservation of part of a force from *possible* conversion, when another part has undergone *actual* conversion, can be admitted for a moment. As Mr. Grove says, it means "necessary mutual reproduction," and nothing less. Consequently, when we speak of the *physical* and *chemical* forces on this hand, and the "vital" and "mental" on that, as being *correlated*, we mean that *heat*, for example, may be converted into *life force* or *mind force*, and that *mind force* and *life force* are wholly convertible into *heat*. It is this or nothing. If "life force" or "mental force" are *partially* surrendered to conversion, we must surrender all. And it does not matter whether the conversion is direct or indirect, only so the *fact* be admitted ultimately. This strict meaning, which is in fact the only legitimate one the word has in the present case, we shall endeavor to keep steadily in view in the following pages.

III. EVOLUTION. This word figures largely in modern physical and natural science, and since we shall frequently meet with it hereafter, we ought not to pass without referring to it. No one should be better able to define it than Mr. Spencer. We will cite his own words. The simplicity and clearness of his definition will especially attract the attention of those who may not have met with it before. Says he, in italics, after protracted preparation, (*First Principles*, page 216,) "*Evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite coherent heterogeneity through continuous differentiations and integrations.*" We shrink from analyzing this definition. It is not so much a definition as a characteristic *condensation* of a large portion of Mr. Spencer's labors from *First Principles* through to *Social Statics.* We leave the reader to make such use of it as he may be able.

IV. FORCE. In the physical world, to go no further at present, there are, comprehensively speaking, two great factors, and, so far as we know, only two.

The one is the *sensible substance* of which all bodies, whether living or not, are composed; and the other is that—whatever it may be—which *produces motion* in them or *tends* to produce it.—*Tyndall, Frag. Science*, p. 75. The one is called *matter*, the other, *force.* It is with this latter alone we are specially concerned. If possible we must obtain perfectly definite views of the *limits* and *contents* of this term. We may premise two statements in advance, in which we believe modern physicists, without many exceptions, would agree. First, Force has a *real existence.* It is not a simple *phenomenon* or *appearance.* Whatever its origin or nature, whether absolute or dependent in its existence, it is nevertheless *something.* Second, Force is *immaterial*, that is, it is not a form of *matter.* It may be a *property* of matter, or it may not; but this much seems certain, it is *not* matter. It is, then, a real immaterial *something.* Whether inseparable from matter, or otherwise, need not concern us now. But to proceed. It will be readily conceded that but few, if any, writers on the subject in hand have succeeded in expressing themselves more clearly than Mr. Grove has in his excellent Essay on the "Correlation and Conservation of Forces," which, case, we shall endeavor to keep steadily in view in the following pages.

III. EVOLUTION. This word figures largely in modern physical and natural science, and since we shall frequently meet with it hereafter, we ought not to pass without noticing here. No one should be better able to define it than Mr. Spencer. We will cite his own words. The simplicity and clearness of his definition will especially attract the attention of those who may not have met with it before. Says he, in italics, after protracted preparation (*First Principles*, page 396): "*Evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations.*" We shrink from analyzing this definition. It is not so much a definition as a characteristic condensation of a large portion of Mr. Spencer's labors from *First Principles* through to *Social Statics*. We leave the reader to make such use of it as he may be able.

IV. FORCE. In the physical world,—to go no further at present,—there are, comprehensively speaking, two great factors, and, so far as we know, only two.

The one is the tangible *substance* of which all bodies, whether living or not, are composed; and the other is that—whatever it may be—which produces motion in them or tends to produce it.—*Tyndall, Fragments*, p. 76. The one is called *matter*, the other, *force*. It is with this latter alone we are specially concerned. If possible we must obtain perfectly definite views of the *nature* and contents of this term. We may premise two statements in advance, in which we believe modern physicists, without many exceptions, would agree. First, Force has a *real existence*. It is not a simple *phenomenon* or *appearance*. Whatever its origin or nature, whether absolute or dependent in its existence, it is nevertheless *a reality*. Second, Force is *immaterial*; that is, it is not a *form of matter*. It may be a *property* of matter, or it may not; but this much seems certain, it is *not* matter. It is, then, a real *immaterial something*. Whether inseparable from matter, or otherwise, need not concern us now. But to proceed. It will be readily conceded that but few, if any, writers on the subject in hand have succeeded in expressing themselves more clearly than Mr. Grove has in his well-known Essay on the "Correlation and Conservation of Forces," which, besides its publication in England, has appeared in this country in the volume of Prof. Youmans already alluded to. "The term force," he says, "although used in very different senses by different authors, in its limited sense may be defined as *that which produces or resists motion*."—*Grove*, p. 19. Or, again, "The term force is used, not as expressing the *effect*, but as *that which produces* the effect." Because, as he says, "the *evidence* of the force *is the motion produced*."—*Grove*, p. 21. Or, again, "Force is that which *produces motion*."—*Murphy*, *Habit and Intelligence*, vol. i, p. 19. "What I mean by the word 'force' is, the *cause* of a *physical action*."—*Faraday*, p. 377. Again: "Force, as we know it, can be regarded only as a certain *conditioned effect* of the *unconditioned cause*, as the *relative reality*, indicating to us an *absolute reality* by which it is immediately produced." [!]—*Spencer*, *First Prin.*, p. 236.

"But," says Mayer, "forces are *causes*." *Force* is the *cause*, and *motion* is the *effect*—the *sign by* which force is manifested. When we observe a *thing in motion*, we *infer* the presence and operation of *force*. According to this, *force* and *motion* are not the same, any more than a cause and its effects are the same. Force is a *cause*, is some*thing*, and has a real existence, though it is not, so far as we know, material. Motion is no*thing*, has only a *phenomenal existence*, and is simply the sensible *effect* produced *in* or *on* matter *by force*. The word "energy" is at present a favorite substitute for the term "force." But some writers make a distinction between these terms, more or less radical. Thus Mr. Murphy, in his suggestive work, "Habit and Intelligence," says, "Energy is not the same as force. All energy has its *origin* in force, but force cannot pass into energy *unless it is at liberty to act*." When it *does* act, what have we? *Energy*, says Mr. Murphy. But, for our own part, we can see nothing but a *force in action*, which action is evidenced in some way by *motion*. We can see no ground whatever for distinguishing force from energy. What Mr. Murphy calls *energy*, and says is "different from force," seems to be only what is called "kinetic energy" in contradistinction to "static" energy. The latter is a *force at rest*, the former is a *force in action*. We would use the word, when we use it at all, as perhaps the best substitute we have for the word *force*. The word *power* is also employed as a synonym of the term force, with besides its publication in England, has appeared in this country in the volume of Prof. Youmans already alluded to. "The term force," he says, "although used in very different senses by different authors, in its limited sense may be defined as that which produces or resists motion."—*Grove*, p. 13. Or, again, "The term force is used, not as expressing the *effect*, but as *that which produces the effect*." Because, as he says, "the evidence of the force is the motion produced."—*Grove*, p. 21. Or, again, "Force is that which produces motion."—*Murphy, Habit and Intelligence*, vol. i, p. 33. "What I mean by the word 'force' is, the cause of a physical action."—*Faraday*, p. 377. Again: "Force, as we know it, can be regarded only as a certain conditioned effect of the unconditioned cause, as the relative reality, indicating to us an absolute reality by which it is immediately produced." (!)—*Spencer, First Prin.*, p. 236.

"But," says Mayer, "forces are causes." *Force* is the *cause*, and *motion* is the *effect*—the sign by which force is manifested. When we observe a thing in motion, we *infer* the presence and operation of *force*. According to this, *force* and *motion* are not the same, any more than a cause and its effects are the same. Force is a cause, is *something*, and has a real existence, though it is not, so far as we know, material. Motion is nothing, has only a *phenomenal* existence, and is simply the sensible *effect* produced in or on matter *by force*. The word "energy" is at present a favorite substitute for the term "force." But some writers make a distinction between these terms, more or less rational. Thus Mr. Murphy, in his suggestive work, "Habit and Intelligence," says, "Energy is not the same as force. All energy has its origin in force, but force cannot pass into energy unless it is at liberty to act." When it does *act*, what have we? *Energy*, says Mr. Murphy. But, for our own part, we can see nothing but a *force in action*, which action is evidenced in some way by motion. We can see no ground whatever for distinguishing force from energy. What Mr. Murphy calls energy, and says is "different from force," seems to be only what is called "kinetic energy" in contradistinction to "static" energy. The latter is a *force at rest*, the former is a *force in motion*. We would use the word, when we use it at all, as perhaps the best substitute we have for the word *force*. The word *power* is also employed as a synonym of the term force, with this to be remarked as a difference: force is used most freely —indeed, is almost monopolized in physics—for denoting the active cause of physical phenomena, especially such as are comprehended under the head of motion. "Power" is used more in the domains of psychology, metaphysics, and theology, in speaking of *mind* and its operations. It is comparatively seldom this term is carried down and applied to physical phenomena.

On the other hand, until quite recently it has been uncommon to use the word *force*, in speaking of *mental* action or of the *actions* of the Deity. But now some, at least, carry it everywhere that activities, or even *capacities*, are displayed. Professor Tyndall, in his late work, "Fragments of Science," p. 31, makes a statement that would give to the term *power* a generic position, and place heat, etc., under it as species. Says he, "Power may exist in the form of MOTION, or it may exist in the form of FORCE *with distance* to act through. The former is *dynamic energy*, the latter is *potential energy*."

This introduces us to a couple of adjective terms at which we may glance in passing. Energy is said to be of two kinds —*potential* and *actual*. The former term, as applied to force, means *passive*, *inactive*, *static*; the latter means, on the contrary, *active* or "kinetic," or "*dynamic*" force or energy. They do not refer to different *things*, but to different *states* of the same thing. We cannot now stop to trace the history of these terms or the distinction they denote. Such are the ordinary significations of the terms above noticed among the vast majority of educated persons, whether scientific or not. We now speak more particularly of the terms *force* and *motion*. But such do not seem to be the significations they have among the more "advanced scientific thinkers" of to-day.

According to Professor Barker, for example, the word force "is used to express the *cause* of motion," also "to indicate motion itself, and finally to express the *effect* of motion." (Page 6.) We will not stop now to inquire what the *effect* of *motion* can be, but will ask on which of these different significations does Professor Barker fix? He says, (page 7,) "By *potential* energy is therefore meant *attraction*, and by *actual* energy *motion*. It is in this *latter* sense that we shall use the word *force* in this lecture," (namely, in his lecture on the "Correlation of the Vital

and Physical Forces.") The title of his lecture might then read, without impropriety, "Correlation of the Vital and Physical Motions." To this substitution of the term "motion" for the term force we now call attention. We hold that no worse mistake could be made on our present ground than to confuse *motion* and *force.* No one thing has ministered more to confusion in fundamental physics—not in practice, but in thought, theory, and language. It may be doubted by some whether it is common among physicists to exchange these terms, or it may even be doubted whether it is not right to do so. It may be thought to indicate greater looseness in the use of language than really exists, unless clear examples shall be given. Unfortunately it is easy to give them.

Speaking of nerve force, Professor Barker says: "This force is *undeniably* motion."—Page 20. Here, according to previous definitions, the *effect* is identified *bodily* with the *cause*, or the *cause* with the *effect.* In fact, the cause *disappears*, and *only* the effect remains. But again the same writer says, "What can *produce motion* but *motion* itself? Into what can motion be *converted* but motion?"—Pp. 8, 9. As regards the first question, we have always supposed force produced motion. Hitherto we would as soon have thought of saying of the wind that the "blowing produced the blowing," or of a rolling ball that the "rolling produced the rolling," as that the "motion produced motion." As regards the second question, "Into what can motion be *converted* but motion?" we reply, *Nothing* that we can think of. Heat is considered, at least by some, and we think correctly, as an active form of *force*, and in our present case it matters not what *form* of force we select, only so it is *force.* As regards the relations of *heat* to motion, for example, we have statements like the following: "Heat and motion are *transformable* one into the other."—*Mayer*, pp. 323–351. "*Heat* is a form of *motion.*"—*Murphy*, pp. 1–21. "Arrested *motion* produces *heat*"—*Grove*, p. 171. "*Heat* has been considered in this essay as *itself motion.*"—*Grove*, p. 68. "*Cold* is *motion.*" —*Grove*, p. 48. "*Motion* may be *converted* into *heat.*"—*Barker*, p. 10. "No other *cause* than *motion* can be found for the *heat* that is produced."—*Mayer*, p. 256. "*Correlation*

between *heat* and *motion*."—*Spencer*, p. 343. "*Heat* as a *mode of motion*."—*Tyndall.*

Here, in one place, *heat produces* motion; in another, *motion produces* heat; in another, they are "correlated;" and finally, "heat *is* motion," and "*cold* is motion." Motion "belongs to the same category" as heat, and in fact *is* heat. But what of *motion* in relation to *other* forces. "Dynamical electricity and magnetism *are themselves motion*."—*Grove*, (*Youmans*,) pp. 187–191. If this is so the converse must be true, namely, *motion* is *electricity*, etc. "Light is therefore *converted into motion*."—*Le Comte*, p. 191. "I have placed *motion* in the same *category* as the *other* affections of matter," namely, as light, heat, electricity, etc.

As we pass along we shall find that all other forms of force, however special, are similarly related to *motion*—they produce motion, motion produces them, they are motion. As regards force in general we have statements like the following: "Motion is to be regarded in this case as the *initiative force*."—*Grove*, (*Youmans*,) p. 145. *Motion* as an *initiative force!* who would have deemed it possible for Mr. Grove so soon to forget and abandon his own definitions? But again: "Motion may be reproduced by the forces which have *emanated from motion*."—*Grove*, p. 137.

Here is a new classification of the different forms of energy, to which we call the reader's attention. Let him reflect on the differences by which the classes are really separated. "The whole stock of energy or working power in the world consists of *attractions*, *repulsions*, and *motions*."—*Tyndall*, *Fragments of Science*, p. 29.

There can be no doubt of it. The *cause* and the *effect* stand on the same level, and belong "to the same category." Motion *itself* is indeed a *cause* since it produces "effects." In ordinary language we speak of a *thing* in motion producing effects. But to speak of "motion *itself*" as producing effects, is to use one of the refinements of the "advanced thinkers." Notwithstanding all this, here is a new role for motion. To convert static force into a "dynamic force, motion must be *superadded* to it."—*Grove*, p. 142. What *is* motion that it can be unbottled and "superadded" to any thing, even to static force? This is worse than the logicians' "vicious circle." We begin with between *heat* and *motion*."—*Grove*, p. 248. "*Heat as a mode of motion*."—*Tyndall*.

Here, in one place, *heat produces motion*; in another, *motion produces heat*; in another, they are "correlates," and finally, "heat *is* motion," and "*cold* is motion." Motion "belongs to the same category" as heat, and in fact *is* heat. But what of motion in relation to other forces. "Dynamical electricity and magnetism are *themselves* motion."—*Grove*, (*Youmans*,) pp. 157–191. If this is so the converse must be true, namely, *motion is electricity*, etc. "Light is therefore converted into motion."—*Le Conte*, p. 191. "I have placed *motion* in the same category as the *other* affections of matter," namely, as light, heat, electricity, etc.

As we pass along we shall find that all other forms of force, however special, are similarly related to motion—they produce motion, motion produces them, they are motion. As regards force in general we have statements like the following: "Motion is to be regarded in this case as the *initiative force*."—*Grove*, (*Youmans*,) p. 145. *Motion as an initiative force!* Who would have deemed it possible for Mr. Grove so soon to forget and abandon his own definitions? But again: "*Motion may be reproduced by the forces which have emanated from motion*."—*Grove*, p. 157.

Here is a new classification of the different forms of energy, to which we call the reader's attention. Let him reflect on the differences *by* which the classes are really separated. "The whole stock of energy or working power in the world consists of attractions, repulsions, and motions."—*Tyndall*, *Fragments of Science*, p. 22.

There can be no doubt of it. The cause and the *effect* stand on the same level, and belong "to the same category." *Motion itself* is indeed a cause since it produces "effects." In ordinary language we speak of a *thing* in motion producing effects. But to speak of "motion *itself*" as producing effects, is to use one of the refinements of the "advanced thinkers." Notwithstanding all this, here is a new role for motion. "To convert static force into a "dynamic force, motion must be *superadded* to it."—*Grove*, p. 143. What is motion that it can be *added* and "*superadded*" to any thing, even to static forces? This is worse than the logicians' "vicious circle." We begin with "correlations" between *forces*, and proceed to correlations between *causes* and their *effects*, and finally to correlations between *something* and *nothing*. This is correlation gone mad!

Finally, force "is a mere *property* of matter;" (*Büchner*, pp. 2, 3,) and indeed force is matter, "for the advanced thinkers" have "*proved* the *unity of force* and *matter*, of spirit and materiality."—*Büchner*, Pref. to ninth ed., lxxx.

This *unification of force* and *matter* is far from common at this day, even among extreme physicists. It is less so, as might be expected, among psychologists or metaphysicians. If it is a common mistake to identify *force* and *motion* as belonging to "the same category," it is a less common, but in our judgment a more pernicious mistake, if possible, to reduce *force* and *matter* to the same category. This being our view briefly stated, it was with no small surprise we read the following passages in the Lowell Lectures on "Science, Philosophy, and Religion," by Professor Bascom, of Williams College. "What is matter? We answer, It is, in its distinct elements, *permanent forms of force—it is force*."—Page 117. "Many forces, not one force, is the just conception of matter. We have, so far as now appears, at least as many distinct, permanently diverse forms of force as we have elements or kinds of matter. Sixty-three irresolvable elements—elements that present *specific and unchangeable properties*—necessitate the belief in as many forms of force, of which these are the ultimate expression," etc.

In these passages *matter* is unmistakably identified with *force*. It is almost discouraging to have *sixty-three permanent* "specific and nuchangable" *new* forms of force thrust upon us so suddenly, just when we were congratulating ourselves on having reduced the comparatively small list we already had, by a succession of conversions or correlations to some one form as the probable parent of the remainder. He says, in relation to the views in question, "Here we shall agree with many physicists," etc. This is true, and we are prepared to hear *Büchner*, for example, make such a statement as the one we have just quoted, but far from prepared for it in the case of one whose powers of thought are so keen and accurate as are those of Professor Bascom.

"correlations" between *forces*, and proceed to correlations between causes and their *effects*, and finally to correlations between *something* and *nothing*. This is correlation gone mad!

Finally, force "*is a mere property of matters*" (*Büchner*, pp. 5, 8,) and indeed force *is* matter, "for the advanced thinkers" have "*proved the unity of force and matter*, of spirit and materiality."—*Büchner, Pref. to ninth ed., xxx.*

This *identification of force and matter* is far from common at this day, even among extreme physicists. It is less so, as might be expected, among psychologists or metaphysicians. If it is a common mistake to identify *force* and motion as belonging to "the same category," it is a less common, but in our judgment a more pernicious mistake, if possible, to reduce *force* and *matter* to the same category. This being our view briefly stated, it was with no small surprise we read the following passages in the Lowell Lectures on "Science, Philosophy, and Religion," by Professor Bascom, of Williams College. "*What* is matter? *We* answer, It is, in its distinct elements, *permanent forms of force—it is force*."—Page 117. "Many forces, not one force, is the just conception of matter. We have, so far as now appears, at least as many distinct, permanently diverse forms of force as we have elements or kinds of matter. Sixty-three irresolvable elements—elements that present *specific and unchangeable properties*—necessitate the belief in as many forms of force, of which these are the ultimate expression," etc.

In these passages, matter is unmistakably identified with *force*. It is almost discouraging to have *sixty-three permanent* "specific and unchangeable" new forms of force thrust upon us so suddenly, just when we were congratulating ourselves on having reduced the comparatively small list we already had, by a succession of conversions or correlations to some one form as the probable parent of the remainder. He says, in relation to the views in question, "Here we shall agree with many physicists," etc. This is true, and we are prepared to hear *Büchner*, for example, make such a statement as the one we have just quoted, but far from prepared for it in the case of one whose powers of thought are so keen and accurate as are those of Professor Bascom.

To speak of nothing further at present, we would be anxious to know how the Professor would reconcile his views of the nature of matter with the doctrine of the *correlation* or *mutual convertibility* of forces. The various forms of physical and chemical force known prior to the wholesale transfer of matter to the category of force are mutually convertible. Now that matter turns up as force, there is some well-grounded hope the dreams of the alchemists may yet be realized. *Gold* is matter, and *matter* is *force. Iron, lead,* etc., in like manner are *forces:* who will have the happiness to convert a few hundred pounds of the *forces* called *iron* or *lead* into the force called *gold* or even *silver?* Or, if this be refused, what reason will be given why THESE forces are mutually convertible, and THOSE not? But we cannot deal in this place with the views set forth in the above quotations. We hope to do so on another occasion in a manner commensurate with their importance.

But to return. Suppose it to be true, as it is said to be by some, that *motion* is *force*, or can be converted into it, or the contrary; and that *matter* is force, and consequently that *force* is matter, and that both may be converted into *motion* or the contrary; let us effect a few verbal exchanges, and see with what propriety these terms can stand in each other's stead. We say, for example, "the force that produces the motion;" and, according to some "advanced thinkers," we may say "the motion that produces the motion." How would it do to say "the *force* that produces the force," or "the *force* that produces the matter," or the "*motion* that produces the matter?" And yet, if preceding statements are true, why not? We speak of "statical" force, and, so far as our knowledge extends, we speak correctly. But why can we not say "statical *motion?*" What kind of a *motion* would that be? It would be an overmatch for "*dynamic* force." Again, we say correctly, "the ball is in motion," and why not the "the ball is in force," or "the ball is in matter?" Finally, we can easily *conceive* motion to *begin* or *end*, but can we thus conceive of *force* or *matter?*

These examples, already too numerous, perhaps, are more than sufficient to justify Professor Tyndall's remark, unwittingly made, in his recent work, "Fragments of Science," (page 18.) "that ambiguity in the use of the term 'force' has been for

To speak of nothing further at present, we would be anxious to know how the Professor would reconcile his views of the nature of matter with the doctrine of the *correlation* or *mutual convertibility* of forces. The various forms of physical and chemical force known prior to the wholesale transfer of matter to the category of force are mutually convertible. Now that matter turns up as force, there is some well-grounded hope the dreams of the alchemists may yet be realized. *Gold* is matter, and matter is *force*. *Iron*, *lead*, etc., in like manner are *forces*: who will have the happiness to convert a few hundred pounds of the forces called *iron* or *lead* into the force called *gold* or even *silver*? Or, if this be refused, what reason will be given why *these* forces are mutually convertible, and *those* not? But we cannot deal in this place with the views set forth in the above quotations. We hope to do so on another occasion in a manner commensurate with their importance.

But to return. Suppose it to be true, as it is said to be by some, that *matter* is *force*, or can be converted into it, or the converse; and that *motion* is force, and consequently that *force* is motion; and that both may be converted into *matter* or the contrary; let us effect a few verbal exchanges, and see with what propriety these terms can stand in each other's stead. We say, for example, "the force that produces the motion;" and, according to some "advanced thinkers," we may say "the motion that produces the motion." How would it do to say "the *force* that produces the force," or "the *force* that produces the matter," or the "*motion* that produces the matter?" And yet, if preceding statements are true, why not? We speak of "statical" force, and, so far as our knowledge extends, we speak correctly. But why can we not say "statical motion?" What kind of a motion would that be? It would be an equivalent for "dynamic force." Again, we say correctly, "the ball is in motion;" and why not then "the ball is in force," or "the ball is in matter?" Finally, we can easily conceive *motion* to begin or end, but can we thus conceive of *force* or *matter*?

These examples, already too numerous, perhaps, are more than sufficient to justify Professor Tyndall's remark, so justly made, in his recent work, "Fragments of Science," (p. 153) "that ambiguity in the use of the term 'force' has been for some time more and more creeping upon us." Now no defense can be made for such loose employment of language. It is especially to be deplored since it occurs at the very foundation of the physical science of to-day. What facts or conceptions in this domain are more fundamental than those of *force* and *motion?*

Is there any one who thinks it a small matter to work such confusion as is wrought by placing *causes* and *effects* in the "same category," making *force* and *motion* not only *co-ordinate*, but *correlative?* Such use of language cannot be justified even on rhetorical grounds. But if it could be, this is no place for mere rhetoric. It supposes that clear and measured use of language and accuracy of thought to which science aspires, and which some of its mistaken votaries arrogate peculiarly to themselves.

We are all the more surprised at such palpable looseness in the use of terms since it occurs among a class of men who, above all others, would seem best fitted to say what they mean, and mean what they say, by reason of their accurate acquaintance with both the phenomena and things to which the terms apply. They are the men who have in their hands always, as they proceed, the test tube, balance, microscope, and polarizer; and who, having brought matter and space within the range of the *calculus*, and having reduced the physical and chemical forces to a point where they talk in quantitative terms of "heat units" and "mechanical equivalents," "foot pounds," etc., seem determined not to stop until they can declare the "mechanical equivalents" or "heat units" represented in the "Iliad" or "Odyssey."

Will it be contended there is any clearness or real utility resulting from the exchange, or rather confusion, of terms to which we have just called attention? We can see how it might accommodate some of the emergencies of the "advanced" to enjoy such unrestricted freedom in the exchange of words. When confronted by a *causal* or *real* obstacle, say *force*, we can see how it might be convenient to substitute for it a merely *phenomenal* or *unreal* one. At one moment you are dealing with force, but the next, without any warning or any good reason why, it has gone and has left only its shadow, *motion*. For what *is* motion apart from the *force* that *causes* it and the

thing that *moves?* It is simply a *state* or *condition.* It *indicates* a *state* of *force*, and *is* a *state* of *matter.*

But here we turn to an examination of the evidence upon which a correlation of the *physical*, *vital*, and *mental* forces is affirmed. We desire to do so in a candid, and, so far as is possible, sympathetic spirit. We know not how it may seem to others, but for our own part we are ready to accept the opinions in question if they are true. Whatever might be thought to the contrary, we are not afraid to accept *any thing* that is shown to be true. But while this is so, for one we are not willing to yield up *old* opinions *because* they are old, nor to receive *new* opinions *because* they are new. The history of opinions touching any important subject will have been read to little purpose if one has not learned a lesson of caution in this respect. It is with such a conservative feeling we would examine the opinions now prevalent concerning the relations and origin of forces.

Whatever we may think of the adequacy or inadequacy of the evidence in relation to the question before us, we have a deep respect for the attainments, and, generally, for the *intentions*, of those whose statements we are to examine.

We are very far from thinking they have always had in their view the consequences—especially the moral and religious consequences—some honestly think this modern doctrine of the "correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces" leads to. So far as we may choose to deal with such consequences, we wish to do so on their own merits; and to avoid, if possible, speaking of them as *motives*, though in some cases this might be fairly done. There can be no doubt that in the discussions between the votaries of religion and science, as such, there is too often a dogmatic, intolerant, unsympathetic spirit displayed on both sides, which there is daily less and less occasion for.

It has now come to pass, we would devoutly hope, that the sanguinary scenes will not be often repeated, that break upon the vision of Professor Huxley, and in one or more of which we suspect the Professor himself has had a hand, at least such as *Saul* had at the stoning of Stephen. He says:

> Who shall number the patient, earnest seekers after truth, from the days of Galileo *until now*, whose lives have been embittered, and their good name blasted, by the mistaken zeal of bibliolaters?

thing that moves? It is simply a state or condition. It indicates a state of force, and not a state of matter.

But here we turn to an examination of the evidence upon which a correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces is affirmed. We desire to do so in a candid, and, so far as is possible, sympathetic spirit. We know not how it may seem to others, but for our own part we are ready to accept the opinions in question if they are true. Whatever might be thought to the contrary, we are not afraid to accept any thing that is shown to be true. But while this is so, for one, we are not willing to yield up old opinions because they are old, nor to receive new opinions because they are new. The history of opinions touching any important subject will have been read to little purpose if one has not learned a lesson of caution in this respect. It is with such a conservative feeling we would examine the opinions now prevalent concerning the relations and origin of forces.

Whatever we may think of the adequacy or inadequacy of the evidence in relation to the question before us, we have a deep respect for the attainments, and, generally, for the intentions, of those whose statements we are to examine.

We are very far from thinking they have always had in their view the consequences—especially the moral and religious consequences—which some honestly think the modern doctrine of the "correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces" leads to. So far as we may decide to deal with such consequences, we wish to do so on their own merits; and to avoid, if possible, speaking of them as motives, though in some cases this might be fairly done. There can be no doubt that in the discussions between the votaries of religion and science, as such, there is too often a dogmatic, intolerant, unsympathetic spirit displayed on both sides, which there is daily less and less occasion for.

It has now come to pass, we would devoutly hope, that the sanguinary scenes will not be often repeated, that break upon the vision of Professor Draper, and in one or more of which we suspect that Professor himself has had a hand, at least such as Saul had in the stoning of Stephen. He says:

> "Who shall number the patient, earnest seekers after truth, from the days of Galileo until now, whose lives have been embittered, and their good name blasted, by the mistaken zeal of Bibliolaters?

. . It is true, if philosophers have suffered their cause has been amply revenged. Extinguished theologians lie about the cradle of every science, as the strangled snakes beside that of Hercules, and history records that whenever science and orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed, if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain. But orthodoxy is the Bourbon of the world of thought. It learns not, neither can it forget; and, though at present bewildered and afraid to move, it is as willing as ever to insist that the first chapter of Genesis contains the beginning and the end of sound science. . . . Philosophers, on the other hand, have no such aggressive tendencies. With eyes fixed on the noble goal to which, "*per aspera et ardua*," they tend, they may, now and then, be stirred to momentary wrath by the unnecessary obstacles with which the ignorant or the malicious encumber, if they cannot bar, the difficult path; but why should their souls be deeply vexed?"—*Lay Sermons*, 278.

How much it is to be hoped "theologians" and "orthodoxy" will cease this blind and ignorant warfare which they have waged from time immemorial, and still continue to wage when the opportunity offers, against these peaceful "philosophers," whose serenity in the pursuit of truth is only broken occasionally by "momentary wrath" at this wretched "orthodoxy," which "learns not, neither can forget" the numberless times it has been "scotched." Let us hope it may not be necessary to dispatch *all* the "theologians," or entirely banish "orthodoxy," until the time shall come when questions even of deep moment can be discussed between the belligerent parties more on their own merits, and less on personal grounds, than formerly seemed possible. This more liberal spirit we may recognize and enjoy without any undue self-gratulation, or disparagement of the past.

We have been at some little pains to classify the evidence referred to, and have concluded to arrange it under three heads, namely: I. FACTS. II. ANALOGIES. III. ASSERTIONS AND IMAGININGS.

I. FACTS.—The class of men whose statements we are now to examine, it is perfectly well known, never venture to announce even a *new* doctrine, only on the solid ground of "facts." In regard to a question that involves our present one, Mr. Spencer says, as we have already seen, (*F. P.*, p. 280,) that "whoever duly weighs the *evidence* [namely, the facts] will see

that *nothing* but an overwhelming *bias* in favor of a preconceived theory can explain its non-acceptance." The evidence must be pretty strong that warrants such a statement as this. We call attention, then,

1. To the *kind* of evidence relied on to show that the physical, vital, and mental forces are correlated. We will quote a paragraph in point from Professor Barker's lecture on the "Correlation of the Vital and Physical Forces." (Page 6.) He says, "Let us inquire how far *organic* and *inorganic* forces may be considered *mutually convertible*, and hence, in so far, *mutually identical*." How does he propose to *do* this? He says, "This may *best* be done by considering, *first*, what is to be *understood* by correlation; and, *second*, how far are the *physical* forces *themselves* correlated to each other."

We have no doubt of the propriety of *first* defining the term "correlation." This is well. But what direct bearing the correlation of the *physical* forces has on the inquiry, "How far the *organic* and *inorganic* (physical) forces may be considered *mutually convertible?*" is more than we can tell. And yet it is by such means he deliberately proposes to solve the problem. The only way in which this line of inquiry could be useful would be in establishing the following proposition: "The physical forces are correlated, *therefore* the *physical* and *vital* are." It seems to us it does not require very great penetration to see that at best this could never lead to more than a presumption or suspicion that the latter half of the proposition is true. The "correlation" of *physical* forces is a *fact*. But to say, *because* this is so, that the *physical* and *vital* are correlated, is openly to beg the whole question.

On the same page Professor Barker says, "At the outset of our discussion we are met by an unfortunate ambiguity of language." Most likely. But the quotation above made shows to our minds a more "unfortunate *ambiguity* in" *logic*. If we mistake not, we shall meet with many other instances in which facts have been kidnapped from one province, and led into uncongenial service in another.

2. *Argument from chemical composition.*—Chemistry demonstrates that the *same elements* exist in *organic* as in *inorganic* bodies. For, says Professor Barker, "*Precisely* the same atoms which build up the *inorganic* fabric compose the organic."

This same argument will hereafter be regarded, perhaps, from other points of view. No one questions the truth of the statement just made, but the *inference* Professor Barker seeks to draw from it can be and ought to be questioned. The inference is, that *because* the *atoms* are the same the "fabrics" must not be essentially different." Now suppose the atoms are the same—what of it? It is not a question of atomic similarity or dissimilarity, but rather of *what is done with atoms.* It is not a question of *atoms* at all, but of *forces.* It is true the atoms may be alike, but the "fabrics" these atoms compose in the two cases are unlike as they could well be.

How do these curious *differences* of "fabric" or "effects" arise? Can they arise without a *cause?* If there be no difference in the *atoms*, there *must* be in the *forces*, since there are remarkable differences in the "fabrics." Admit *something* new on the *causal* side, in the case of these *organic* "fabrics," we must, or fall into absurdities. But beyond this, must we ascribe in relation to these "fabrics" *any action* to the *atoms*, as it is quietly assumed we must? To us one of the most wonderful facts in the whole case is, that so many and such widely different things can be *done*, with about *four kinds* of atoms, namely, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen.

There is almost as good reason for thinking that the bricks, stones, mortar, timber, nails, etc., conspired and went together of their own accord, into their proper places, and "composed" the various different "fabrics" called houses, as to think the atoms did in the case of the "fabrics" called plants and animals. This is not a question of chemical composition; it is, we repeat, a question of *forces.* A brick in that heap and a brick in yonder palace wall are essentially the same. But that *confused heap* of materials is not the same as the *palace*, though the *materials* in the two cases *are the same.* In like manner, the *atoms* in the *inorganic* world may be, and *are*, the same as those in the *organic* world. But there is all the difference between the *mass* of atoms in the *one* case, and the complicated "fabric" of atoms in the other, that there is between the confused heap and the palace. Nay, the parallel does not reach deep enough. In the case of the palace the bricks do not acquire any new prerogatives, either as a consequence or condi-

tion of being built into the palace. But it is not so in the case of the *atoms. Qualitatively* speaking, the palace, as a whole, has nothing whatever, save what its components were known to have in the separate state. But not so this "organic fabric." The atoms really do, or are *made* to do, things, or enter into combinations, so far as we know, impossible to them in the *inorganic* world. Can any one deny this? It is not simply a *structure*, but a *living* structure we have to account for. Whence these *new* prerogatives? That the atoms do not have any such powers, or, at least, never display them in other conditions, there can be no question. That it does not depend on any change in the *substance* of the atoms, the proof is as complete as it could well be. There is no evidence whatever, for example, that a particle of carbon ever ceases to be a particle of carbon. There is no proof whatever that these atoms can come together and form the *living* structure, or indeed any other kind of *structure.*

Whence, then, these *new* prerogatives? Have they been "superadded," or were they *latent* in the atoms during their existence in the *inorganic* state? If the latter, *what* kept them quiet *there*, or educed them into active manifestation *here?* The answer comes to us promptly from all sides: "Mysterious agencies," "unknown and unknowable causes," "unusual conditions," "certain conditions," "subtle influences," etc. If you cannot *compel*, with all the complicated appliances of modern chemistry, C^{12} H^{22} O^{11} to unite and form sugar, what causes them to do it *seemingly without* compulsion in the humble little cell? It is trivial to tell us, as is sometimes done, "It is true chemistry has not succeeded in doing this thus far, but *will* in due time." It will be time enough to use such a datum when it comes to hand. It speaks loudly as to the poverty of a case which is compelled to cover its nakedness by drawing on future *possible* resources.

3. The "correlation" and physical origin of "vital" force, for example, is attempted to be shown indirectly by asserting "vitality," "life," or "vital force," "is the *sum* of the energies of a living body."—*Barker*, p. 15. In other words, "vital force" is a *compound* of simpler forces. "It is a *result.*" Life force is neither *chemical* force, nor *electrical*, nor *thermal*, etc., alone, but a *compound* of all of them. In this way the ques-

tion of being built into the palace. But it is not so in the case of the cross. *Quantitatively* speaking, the palace, as a whole, has nothing whatever, save what its components were known to have in the separate state. But not so this "organic fabric." The atoms really do, or are made to do, things, or enter into combinations, so far as we know, impossible to them in the inorganic world. Can any one deny that? It is not simply a structure, but a *living* structure we have to account for. Whence these new prerogatives? That the atoms do not have any such powers, or, at least, never display these in other conditions, there can be no question. That it does not depend on any change in the substance of the atoms, the proof is as complete as it could well be. There is no evidence whatever, for example, that a particle of carbon ever ceases to be a particle of carbon. There is no proof whatever that these atoms can come together and form the *living* structure, or indeed any other kind of structure.

Whence, then, these new prerogatives? Have they been "superadded," or were they *latent* in the atoms during their existence in the inorganic state? If the latter, what kept them quiet *there*, or evoked them into active manifestation *here*? The answer comes to us promptly from all sides: "Mysterious agencies," "unknown and unknowable causes," "unusual conditions," "certain conditions," "subtle influences," etc. If you cannot *compel*, with all the complicated appliances of modern chemistry, $C^{12} H^{22} O^{11}$ to unite and form sugar, what causes them to do it seemingly *without compulsion* in the humble little cell? It is trivial to tell us, as is sometimes done, "It is true chemistry has not succeeded in doing this thus far, but *will* in due time." It will be time enough to use such a datum when it comes to hand. It speaks loudly as to the poverty of a case which is compelled to cover its nakedness by drawing on future *possible* resources.

3. The "correlation" and physical origin of "vital" force, for example, is attempted to be shown indirectly by asserting "vitality," "life," or "vital force," "is the *sum* of the energies of a living body."—*Barker*, p. 15. In other words, "vital force" is a compound of simpler forces. "It is a result." "This force is neither *chemical* force, nor *electrical*, nor *thermal*, etc., alone, but a *compound* of all of them. In this way the ques-

tion is evaded as to whether it is any *particular* form of physical force. "Life, then, is a compound."

Now there are two ways of determining what the actual constituent elements are that make up a given compound. These are synthesis and analysis. Either the elements must be seen to enter and compose the compound under conditions known to exclude all others, or the compound must be analyzed. Generally it is best to resort to both methods, which mutually check and correct each other. But without resorting to one method or the other, it is not possible to determine with any accuracy what are the constituents. This is true even for *material* compounds. The case is not changed when we come to a *dynamic* compound, if there be such a thing. Now has any one ever performed, or even traced, either the analytic or synthetic process in regard to this assumed *dynamic* "compound," "sum," "result?" Not that we have ever been able to ascertain. If it has not been done, who knows what this compound does contain—not to speak of what it *does not* contain? Beyond this, who *knows* it is a compound? Is there any proof there is such a thing as a compound force, in a sense similar to that of a *material* chemical compound? The very fact of *correlation* is squarely opposed to such a view. There is no more reason to think different forces can unite to form a compound than there is to think, in regard to matter, that the various kinds are "mutually convertible," as *forces* are.

But suppose it is said, "vital" force is not a compound, but a *mixture;* or, as Professor Bain says, "a collocation." What then? We must confess ourselves unable to understand in what way a *mere* "collocation" could produce any definite "result" of the *kind* we are now contemplating. It is not a *mechanical* or *chemical* result we want. It is a *living force* we want. How can this "collocation" of forces yield it? We cannot so much as imagine, only by uniting to form a compound as already noticed. Look at this case as we may, and it appears unable to afford any support to the view it professes to serve.

But aside from such considerations, it must be remembered, in the case of a compound, the parts not only differ from each other but from the whole. The parts cannot represent each tion is needed as to whether it is any *particular* form of physical force. "Life, then, is a compound."

Now there are two ways of determining what the actual constituent elements are that make up a given compound. These are synthesis and analysis. Either the elements must be seen to unite and compose the compound under conditions known to exclude all others, or the compound must be analyzed. Generally it is best to resort to both methods, which mutually check and correct each other. But without resorting to one method or the other, it is not possible to determine with any accuracy what are the constituents. This is true even for *material* compounds. The case is not changed when we come to a *dynamic* compound, if there be such a thing. Nor has any one ever performed, or even traced, either the analytic or synthetic process in regard to this assumed dynamic "compound," "sum," "result." Not that we have ever been able to ascertain. If it has not been done, who knows what this compound does comprise—not to speak of what it does not comprise? Beyond this, who *knows* it is a compound? Is there any proof there is such a thing as a compound force, in a sense similar to that of a *material* chemical compound? The very fact of correlation is squarely opposed to such a view. There is no more reason to think different forces unite to form a compound than, there is to think, in regard to matter, that the various kinds are "mutually convertible," as forces are.

But suppose it is said, "vital" force is not a compound, but a "mixture," or, as Professor Bain says, "a collocation." What then? We must confess ourselves unable to understand in what way a mere "collocation" could produce any definite "result" of the kind we are now contemplating. It is not a *mechanical* or *chemical* result we want. It is a *living* force we want. How can this "collocation" of forces yield it? We cannot so much as *imagine*, only by uniting to form a compound as already noticed. Look at this case as we may, and it appears unable to afford any support to the view it professes to serve.

But aside from such considerations it must be remembered, in the case of a compound, the parts not only differ from each other but from the whole. The parts cannot represent each other, nor the whole, any more than oxygen and hydrogen adequately represent each other or water. Separate these elements, and you do not have water any longer. Similarly, if you separate the component forces that make up life-force, life is gone. To examine each element apart from the others would not necessarily yield a single clue, as to the characteristics of the resulting compound. And yet when Professor Barker comes to examine "life" or "vitality," it is by taking singly the *presumed* elements that compose it, or simply its manifestations. He says, (page 16:)

> But approaching our question still more closely, let us, in illustration of the vital forces of the animal economy, choose three *forms of its manifestation* in which to seek for evidence of correlation. These shall be, heat evolved within the body, muscular energy or *motion*, and, lastly, nervous energy, or that form of force which on the one hand stimulates a muscle to contract, and on the other appears in forms called mental.

The three cases cited above are those upon which most writers fasten in endeavoring to show a *correlation* between the physical, vital, and mental forces. We will examine these in the order they have been referred to.

(1.) *Animal Heat.* Where does the heat come from that is produced in the living animal body? We here quote Professor Barker. He says:

> As to its *origin*, it is evident that since *potential energy* exists in the food which enters the body, and is there *converted into force*, (!) a portion of it may become the actual energy of heat. And since, too, the heat produced in the body is precisely such as would be set free by the combination of the food outside of it, it is fair to assume it thus originates. To this may be added the chemical argument that, while food capable of yielding heat by combustion is taken into the body, its constituents are completely, or almost completely, oxidized before leaving it; and since oxidation always evolves heat, the heat of the body must have its origin in the oxidation of the food. . . . We conceive, however, no long argument is necessary to prove that animal heat results from a conversion of energy within the body, or that the *vital force*, *heat*, is as truly correlated to the other forces as when it has a purely physical origin. —*Barker*, pp. 16, 17.

When we first read this paragraph we supposed it to be simply introductory to the main statement yet to follow. But we confess to no small surprise and disappointment to find that this is all.

ether, nor the whole, any more than oxygen and hydrogen adequately represent each other or water. Separate these elements, and you no not have water any longer. Similarly, if you separate the component forces that make up life-force, life is gone. To examine each element apart from the others would not necessarily yield a single clue as to the characteristics of the resulting compound. And yet when Professor Barker comes to examine "life" or "vitality," it is by taking singly the *persisting elements* that compose it, or simply its manifestations. He says, (page 10:)

But approaching our question still more closely, let us, in illustration of the vital forces of the animal economy, choose three *forms of its manifestations* in which to seek for evidence of correlation. These shall be, heat evolved within the body; muscular energy or motion; and, lastly, nerve energy, or that form of force which on the one hand stimulates a muscle to contract, and on the other appears as a force called neurcity.

The three cases cited above are those upon which most writers fasten in endeavoring to show a correlation between the physical, vital, and mental forces. We will examine these in the order they have been referred to.

(1). *Animal Heat.* Where does the heat come from that is produced in the living animal body? We here quote Professor Barker. He says:

As to its origin, it is evident that since *potential* energy exists in the food which enters the body, and is there *converted into heat*, (!) a portion of it *may* become the actual energy of heat. And since, too, the heat produced in the body is precisely such as would be set free by the combustion of the food outside of it, it is fair to assume it thus originates. To this may be added the abundant argument that, while food capable of yielding heat by combustion is taken into the body, its complete ate are completely, or almost completely, oxidized before excretion; and since oxidation always evolves heat, the heat of the body must have its origin in the oxidation of the food. . . . We consider, however, no long argument is necessary to prove that animal heat results from a conversion of energy within the body, or that the *vital force, heat,* is as truly amenable to the solar forces as when it has a purely physical origin. —*Barker,* pp. 10, 11.

When we first read this paragraph we supposed it to be simply introductory to the main statements yet to follow. But we confess to no small surprise and disappointment to find that this is all.

Having thus disposed of the first example, the Professor turns complacently to the second point, or "*muscular energy.*" The real point is to show that the *physical* and *vital* forces are *mutually convertible.* Now what has the Professor done? He has shown, what nobody denies, that the *food* carries in *potential* energy, or *force locked up,* into the body, and that *oxygen,* in a way *similar* to a common one outside of the body, liberates it every-where in the organism in the form of heat. Absolutely this is all. It is hardly to be credited that Professor Barker did not see the real point at issue had not been even touched.

We have sought diligently but unsuccessfully for evidence that heat is changed into vital force, and vital force into heat. The only case we have found that even *seems* to fulfill the distinct promise made us, is the one presented by Dr. Carpenter in his essay on the "Correlation of the Physical and Vital Forces." But we reserve that case for special consideration. We have simply had an instance similar to one we may witness daily in our grates and lamps; namely, *statical* or *potential* force, converted into *active* or "*kinetic*" force, or *heat,* by *oxidation* or *combustion.*

(2.) *Muscular Energy.*—This is displayed whenever muscle *contracts.* Now what kind of force is this, and where does it come from? Here we will again quote the statement of Professor Barker. Says he, "In studying the characters of muscular action we notice first that, as in the case of heat, the *force* which it develops is in no wise different from *motion* in *inorganic* nature." Before we quote the remainder of the passage we must stop to notice in this statement:

(*a*) "Heat" is said to "develop" force. Is *heat,* then, *not* a force, or form of force? If there is one certain fact in regard to heat we suppose it to be that it is a form of force or energy. An *active* force, yes, a "molecular" force, if you please, but still *a force.* But no one would think so from an attentive consideration of the first part of the above extract.

(*b*) By *force* in the passage cited is evidently meant *muscular* force, *contracting* force. *This* force, which is far from being understood, and upon which but little real light has ever been thrown by all that has been said or done, is declared by Professor Barker to be "in nowise different from *motion in inorganic* nature!"

Having thus disposed of the first example, the Professor turns complacently to the second point or "conversion" stage. The real point is to show that the physical and vital forces are mutually convertible. Now what has the Professor done? He has shown, what nobody denies, that the food eaten is potential energy, or force locked up, into the body; and that oxygen, in a way similar to a common one outside of the body, liberates it everywhere in the organism, in the form of heat. Absolutely this is all. It is hardly to be wondered that Professor Barker did not see the real point at issue had not been even touched.

We have sought diligently but unsuccessfully for evidence that heat is converted into vital force, and vital force into heat. The only case we have found that even seems to fulfill the distinct promise made us, is the one presented by Dr. Carpenter in his essay on the "Correlation of the Physical and Vital Forces." But we reserve that case for special consideration. We have simply had an instance similar to one we can witness daily in our garden and lawns: namely, alcohol or petroleum force, converted into action or "kinetic" force, or heat, by oxidation or combustion.

(c.) *Muscular Force.*—This is displayed whenever muscle contracts. Now what kind of force is this, and whence does it come from? Here we will again quote the statement of Professor Barker. Says he, "In studying the characters of muscular action we notice first that, as in the case of heat, the force which it develops is in no wise different from motion in inorganic nature." Before we quote the remainder of the passage we must stop to notice in this statement:

(a) "Heat" is said to "develop" force. Is *heat*, then, not a force, or form of force? If there is one certain fact in regard to heat we suppose it to be that it is a form of force or energy. Molecular force, yes, a "molecular" force, if you please, but still a force. But no one would think so from an attentive consideration of the first part of the above extract.

(b) By *force* in the passage cited is evidently meant molecular force, contracting force. This force, which is far from being understood, and upon which, but little real light has been thrown by all that has been said or done, is declared by Professor Barker to be "in no wise different from motion in inorganic nature!"

We might safely defy any one to produce a finer example of logical self-imposition than this. Instead of confronting the "*force*" which stands in the way, "stubborn thing" that it is, he turns about handsomely, and deals with its shadow, *motion*. The muscle *moves* when it contracts, the ball *moves* on yonder table, and, marvelous to relate, they fraternize in the intimate synthesis of *correlation*. *Now*, he slips over from *force* to *motion*, from *cause* to *effect*; *then*, from *motion* to *force*, from *effect* to *cause*, just as may best subserve the emergency in which he happens to be. With one wave of the Professor's wand the *reality* has disappeared, and in its stead is a mere *appearance*. We have already called attention to this illegitimate interchange of the terms *force* and *motion*, and would refer the reader to that part of this paper. But to proceed with the statement:

> In the early part of the lecture, motion produced by the contraction of muscle was used to show the conversion of mass force into molecular force. . . . Liebig, in 1842, asserted that for the production of muscular force the food must first be converted into muscular tissue, a view until recently adopted by physiologists. It has been conclusively shown, however, within a few years, that muscular force cannot come from the oxidation of its own substance, since the products of this metamorphosis are not increased in amount by muscular energy, [action.] . . . But while the products of tissue oxidation do not increase with the increase of muscular exertion, the amount of carbonic acid gas exhaled by the lungs is increased in the exact ratio of work done. *No doubt* can be entertained, *therefore*, that the actual energy of the muscle is simply the converted potential energy of the carbon of the food. A muscle, *therefore*, like a steam-engine, *is a machine* for converting the *potential energy* of carbon into *motion*. But, *unlike* a steam-engine, the muscle accomplishes the conversion directly, the energy not passing through the intermediate stage of heat. For this reason the muscle is the most economical *producer* of mechanical *force* known.

(*a*) We object to the statement that muscle is a "producer" of force, whether "mechanical" or otherwise. It may convert force from one form to another, but does not in any proper sense produce it.

(*b*) In this case it has been promised us we should see physical converted into vital force. But what has been really shown? First, that food in which physical force is locked up goes into he body, under the name of potential energy. Second, this force

We might safely defy any one to produce a finer example of logical self-imposition than this. Instead of confronting the "*force*" which stands in the way, "stubborn thing" that it is, he turns about handsomely, and deals with its shadow, *motion*. The muscle moves when it contracts, the ball moves on yonder table, and, marvellous to relate, they fraternize in the intimate synthesis of correlation. *Now*, he slips over from *force* to *motion*, from *cause* to *effect*; *then*, from *motion* to *force*, from *effect* to *cause*, just as may best subserve the emergency in which he happens to be. With one wave of the Professor's wand the *reality* has disappeared, and in its stead is a mere *appearance*. We have already called attention to this illegitimate interchange of the terms *force* and *motion*, and would refer the reader to that part of this paper. But to proceed with the statement:

In the early part of the lecture, motion produced by the contraction of muscle was used to show the conversion of mass force into molecular force. . . . Liebig, in 1842, asserted that for the production of muscular force the food must first be converted into muscular tissue, a view until recently adopted by physiologists. It has been conclusively shown, however, within a few years, that muscular force cannot come from the oxidation of its own substance, since the products of this metamorphosis are not increased in amount by muscular energy, [action] . . . But while the products of tissue oxidation do not increase with the increase of muscular exertion, the amount of carbonic acid gas exhaled by the lungs is increased in the exact ratio of work done. *No doubt* can be entertained, *therefore*, that the actual energy of the muscle is simply the converted potential energy of the carbon of the food. A muscle, *therefore*, like a steam-engine, is a machine for converting the *potential* energy of carbon into motion. But, *unlike* a steam-engine, the muscle accomplishes the conversion directly, the energy not passing through the intermediate stage of heat. For this reason the muscle is the most economical *producer* of mechanical *force* known.

(*a*) We object to the statement that muscle is a "producer" of force, whether "mechanical" or otherwise. It may convert force from one form to another, but does not in any proper sense produce it.

(*b*) In this case it has been promised us we should see physical converted into vital force. But what has been really shown? First, that food in which physical force is locked up goes into the body, under the name of potential energy. Second, this force is liberated during the decomposition of the food. Part of it appears as heat, (up to this point we are simply on the track of our animal heat case,) but part disappears *some other way*, and is *supposed* to become, in some way, the force manifested and expended in muscular contraction; and that the force expended in muscular contraction is not liberated from decomposing muscular tissue, but in part, at least, from the decomposition of carbonaceous food. There is good reason to think physical force is somehow taken up and used by muscle in doing its work. But how? Is there any proof that the force expended in muscular contraction is vital? If it is not known to be vital force, what assurance have we this is a case of correlation between physical and vital forces? Is this force of contraction to be distinguished, or not, from the force or power that makes a muscle? Have these questions ever been answered scientifically?

Now, incredible as it may appear to some, we have actually been looking into this matter a little. Professor Barker says, muscle "is a machine." Very well. We see no more reason to think the working or contracting force is the proper vital force which makes and repairs the muscle, than to think the force that drives a steam-engine is the same as the man who made, repairs, and controls it. Haidenhaim and others have shown, happily for us, that the action of a muscle is not conditioned on the disintegration of its own structure, as was formerly asserted by Liebig, but on the decomposition of food. The force that is employed in working the engine, and the force that made, repairs, and controls it, are widely different things. We see no good reason to think the case different when we come to that "machine" we call muscle. What we are waiting to see is the force used in working the "machine" converted into the force that makes and repairs it. But, instead of this, what have we? As in the case of animal heat, food goes in as the bearer of physical force, which is liberated in the machine or muscle in some such way, let us suppose, as steam is in the steam-chest, and the machine works. Now is there the slightest proof in all this that heat, for example, has really been converted into vital force, or *vice versa?* The question as to the origin of this undoubted vital force, which we may call constructive, remains as yet wholly untouched.

But we shall examine this point more at length when speaking of Dr. Carpenter's paper.

3. *Nerve Force.*—Again we quote from Professor Barker's lecture.

> The last of the so-called vital forces which we are to examine is that *produced* (?) by the nerves and nervous centers. In the nerve which stimulates a muscle to contract, *this force* is *undeniably motion*, since it is propagated along this nerve from one extremity to the other. . . . That this force is not electricity . . . Du Bois Reymond has demonstrated, by showing that its velocity is only ninety-seven feet in a second, a speed equaled by the grayhound and the race-horse. . . . But that this agent is a *force* as analogous to electricity as is magnetism is shown not only by the fact that the transmission of electricity along a nerve will cause the contraction of the muscle to which it leads, but also by the more important fact that the contraction of a muscle is excited by diminishing its normal electric current, a result which could take place only with a stimulus closely allied to electricity. Nerve force, *therefore*, must be a transmitted *potential energy*.—*Barker*, p. 20.

On this we remark:

(*a*) We need not question the correctness of Professor Barker's conclusion, that nerve force is "closely allied to electricity." But is it *vital force?* Is there any real evidence that the *force* (not the *motion*) that passes along a nerve is *vital* any more than there is that the electricity is *vital* force, which may be substituted for it in exciting muscular contraction?

Suppose, then, it should be *proved* that *physical* or *chemical* force is or may be transformed into *nerve* force, what relation would this have to the *real* question, unless it can be shown that nerve force *is vital* force? Has this ever been done? Not so far as we know. Professor Barker simply *assumes* that nerve force is vital force. This nerve force is the *working* force that is sent here and there, but is *not* the force that *stays at home* in the *nerve cell*, or in the *muscular fiber*, and momentarily presides, guides, and controls in the development, growth, and continuous repair of the same, never for one moment to desert them while they are *living*. The moment the animal is *dead* to which the parts belong, that moment the vital force is gone never to return. Its going *constitutes death*, in fact. But this is not true of *nerve* force. It remains, and in most cases can be acted on, or caused to act, after the animal has been *killed*. By irritating the nerves of an animal, muscular action

796208

can be excited that it would seem can only be ascribed to the transmission of nerve force along the nerves to the muscles. But all this while there can be no doubt the animal is *dead.* It may some day be proved that nerve force *is vital* force, but we have yet to see the first fact that points directly to such a conclusion, while we see many that point directly the other way.

4. *Correlation between Physical and Mental Forces.*—Says Professor Barker:

> Has the upper region called intelligence and reason any relations to physical force? This realm has not escaped the searching gaze of science, and though in it investigations are vastly more difficult than in any one of the regions thus far considered, yet some results of great value have been obtained which may help us to a solution of our problem. It is to be observed at the outset that every external manifestation of thought force is a muscular one, . . . and hence this force [*thought* force] must be *intimately correlated to nerve force.*—*Barker*, pp. 20, 21.

Before passing on we must notice a point or two in the quotation made. What is meant by "thought force" here? Is it will power? If not, what is it? But whatever it may be, what necessity is there for saying it is "intimately correlated to nerve force?" As we have already intimated, the status of nerve force is by no means fixed, which leaves the question still in uncertainty, even though it should be proved that "thought force" and nerve force are "intimately correlated." Then, again, this expression "intimately correlated" seems to be made on a mistaken view of correlation. It implies there are degrees in correlation. But we know nothing about degrees in the correlation of forces. Forces that are partially, are *ipso facto* wholly, correlatable. No part of a force can be reserved. It is all or none. The process of conversion once begun, there is no limit to it only by stopping the process. Correlation means, as we have seen, "necessary mutual reproduction." Where the place can be, then, for this discriminating term "intimate," it is difficult to see. But here are the cases upon which the "searching gaze of science" has been fixed, and from which "results of great value have been obtained, which may help us to a solution of our problem."

> A blank sheet of paper excites no emotion; even covered with Assyrian cuneiform characters, its alternations of black and white

awaken no response in the ordinary brain. It is only when by a repetition of these impressions the brain cell has been educated, that these before meaningless characters awaken thought. Is thought, then, simply a *cell action* which may or may not result in muscular expression; an action which originates truth *precisely* as a calculating machine evolves new combinations of figures?

Precisely so. But "whatever we define thought to be, this *fact* appears certain, that it is capable of external manifestation by *conversion* into the actual energy of motion, and *only* by this *conversion*." So much for the *outward* manifestation of thought, or "thought force." Its *inward* manifestation we will come to presently. On the passage just quoted we remark:

(*a*) We are not so sure about that sheet of "Assyrian cuneiform characters." In our own case, and that of some others we have known, a most lively "emotion" or "response," say of curiosity at first sight, has been awakened on beholding them. And as regards those characters we know our brains are only "ordinary." Then we are impressed with the simplicity of the process of education. We sometimes speak of getting things in a "*nut shell*." But here the question lies in a much smaller compass—in a "*brain cell*." "It is only when, by a frequent repetition of these impressions, the *brain cell* has been *educated*, that these before meaningless characters awaken thought." Let educators take note of this charmingly simple result, revealed by "the searching gaze of science."

(*b*) But whatever may be said, "this fact appears *certain*," that *thought* "is capable of external manifestation by conversion into the actual energy of *motion*, and *only* by this conversion." "This is certain." If thought is truly changed into *motion*, according to our view it is changed into *nothing*. In reading this backward two courses are open to us. Either it turns out that thought is nothing, or that something is turned into nothing, or, on the contrary, nothing into something. What else have we, indeed, if *force* is converted into *motion*, or *motion* is converted into *force?* If it is changed into the *energy* or force that *causes* motion, then it must be a form of force. Now what makes this appear "certain?" Would the reader believe there is no evidence of this "fact" save the *fact itself?* Thought is changed into the "energy of motion" *because* it is so changed.

awaken no response in the ordinary brain. It is only when by a repetition of these impressions the brain cell has been educated that those before unmeaning characters awaken thought. Is thought, then, simply a *cell* motion which may or may not result in immediate expression; an instant which originates trains precisely as a calculating machine evolves new combinations of figures?

Precisely so. But "whatever we define thought to be, this appears certain, that it is capable of external manifestation by conversion into the actual energy of motion, and only by this conversion." So much for the *external* manifestation of thought, or "thought force." Its *internal* manifestation we will come to presently. On the passage last quoted we remark:

(a) We are not so sure about that sleep of "Assyrian cuneiform characters." In our own case, and that of some others we have known, a most lively "emotion" or "response," say of curiosity at first sight, has been awakened on beholding them. And as regards those characters we know our brains are only "ordinary." Thus we are impressed with the simplicity of the process of education. We sometimes speak of getting things in a "*nut shell*." But here the question lies in a much smaller compass—in a "*brain cell*." "It is only when, by a frequent repetition of these impressions, the brain cell has been educated that those before unmeaning characters awaken thought." Let educators take note of this charmingly simple result, revealed by "the searching gaze of science."

(b) But whatever may be said, "this fact appears *certain*," that *thought* "is capable of external manifestation by conversion into the actual energy of motion, and only by this conversion." "*This is certain*." If thought be only changed into motion, according to our view it is changed into nothing. In reading this backward two answers are open to us. Either it turns out that thought is nothing, or that something is turned into nothing, or, on the contrary, nothing into something. What else have we, indeed, if *force* is converted into *motion*, or motion is converted into *force*? If it is changed into the energy or force that causes motion, then it must be a form of *force*. Now what makes this appear "certain"? Would the reader believe there is no evidence of this "fact" *save the fact itself*? Thought is changed into the "*energy of motion*" because it is so changed.

Reduced to its simplest form, such is the way the argument reads. Besides this evidence there is none other, so far as we know. If we admit all the Professor says, we seem obliged to infer that thought is a form of force. We have always supposed thought to be an *act of the mind*, *not* its force or power. We have always made a distinction between *thought* and the *mind* that *thinks*, similar to that we make between *running* and the *man* that *runs*, or between *motion* and the *force* that *causes* it. Scientifically speaking, no mistake could be more fundamental than that of confusing *thought* and *force*. It is the same mistake as to confuse the *act* with the *actor*. "Such knowledge is too high for us." But to proceed.

> But here the question arises, Can it (thought) be manifested *inwardly* without such a transformation of energy? or is the evolution of thought *entirely* independent of the matter of the brain? Experiments ingenious and reliable have answered this question.—*Barker*, p. 21.

But before passing on to see what the experiments are, we must notice again the point is to convert physical force into "thought force." Also, we must remark, we are not shut up to any such pair of alternatives as are presented us in the question, "Is the evolution of thought entirely independent of the matter of the brain?" The alternatives are, either admit thought is entirely dependent on, or "entirely independent of, the matter of the brain." The following case would seem to be a parallel one: Either admit the planing is entirely dependent on, or entirely independent of, the jack plane. The *man* who *shoves* the *plane* and *mind* that *uses* the *cell* are alike, and with equal propriety, put out of the account.

But now for the "experiments, ingenious and reliable." A couple of small metal bars were taken. One of them was of bismuth, the other was of an alloy of antimony and zinc.

> Preliminary trials having shown that any change in temperature within the skull was soonest manifested externally in that depression which exists just below the occipital protuberance, a pair of these little bars was fastened to the head at this point, and to neutralize the results of a general rise in temperature over the whole body, a second pair reversed in direction was attached to the leg or arm, so that if a like increase of heat came to both, the electricity developed by one would be neutralized by the other,

> and no effect produced upon the needle unless only one was affected. By long practice it was ascertained that a state of mental torpor could be induced, lasting for hours, in which the needle remained stationary. But let a person knock at the door outside the room, or speak a single word, even though the experimenter remained absolutely passive, and the reception of the intelligence caused the needle to swing through twenty degrees. In explanation of this production of heat, the analogy of the muscle at once suggests itself. No conversion of energy is complete, and as the heat of muscular action represents force which has escaped conversion into *motion*, so the heat evolved during the reception of an idea is energy which has escaped conversion into thought from precisely the same cause.

Now how does the Professor *know* that the presumed and hidden remainder, which is supposed to have escaped conversion into heat, was really converted "into thought?" How does he know, indeed, there is a remainder, not to speak of what is done with it? But perhaps these questions will be answered further on. He continues:

> Moreover, these experiments have shown that ideas which affect the emotions produce most heat in their reception—a few moments' recitation to one's self of emotional poetry producing more effect than several hours of deep thought. Hence it is evident that the *mechanism* for the *production* of deep thought accomplishes this *conversion* of energy far more perfectly than that which produces simple emotion. But we may take a step further in this direction. A muscle, precisely as the law of correlation requires, develops less heat when doing work than when it contracts without doing it. Suppose, now, that besides the simple reception of an idea by the brain, the thought is expressed outwardly by some muscular sign. The conversion now takes two directions, and, in addition to the production of thought, a portion of the energy appears as nerve and muscle power; less, therefore, should appear as heat according to our law of correlation. Dr. Lombard's experiments have shown that the amount of heat developed by the recitation to one's self of emotional poetry, was in every case when that recitation was oral, that is, had a muscular expression. . . . Nor do these facts rest on physiological evidence alone. Chemistry teaches that thought force, like muscle force, *comes from food*, and *demonstrates* that the force evolved by brain, like that produced by the muscle, comes *not* from the disintegration of its *own tissue*, but is the converted energy of burning carbon. Can we longer doubt, then, that the brain, too, *is a machine* for the conversion of energy? Can we longer refuse to believe that even thought is in *some mysterious way correlated* to the *other* natural forces, and this even in the face of the fact that it has never been measured?

In this somewhat lengthy extract the evidence is summed up by the Professor of Physiological Chemistry in Yale College, that "demonstrates" that "thought force" "is the converted energy of burning carbon." Moreover, the brain "is a machine," for accomplishing this conversion. The evidence of this is so strong as to lead the Professor to ask with inquisitive surprise, "Can we longer refuse to believe?" etc. After *such* an array of "facts," is it possible that *any* one can be found who has "such an overwhelming bias," as Mr. Spencer would say, as to refuse to fall into line?

This evidence may be reduced to the simple head of animal heat produced during *nervous* action, the same apparently as we have seen during muscular action.* In certain states, or during certain acts, say of an emotional nature, more heat appears than during some others not so highly emotional, or attended by less muscular exercise. It seems then, we may notice in passing, we do not speak amiss when we say of an emotional nature, "it is *warm.*"

That this production of heat during mental action, whether emotional or not, interesting fact as it is, indicates some relation, and probably one that is quite "intimate," between physical or chemical force and thought or emotion, there need be no question. But that these facts warrant us in assuming, least of all prove, a correlation between physical force and "thought force," whatever it may be, we fail entirely see. To assert a relation is one thing, to assert a correlation is quite another. We doubt not that "in some mysterious way" physical force and "thought force" are related. But that there is any evidence that warrants the conclusion that these forces are correlated in the sense claimed for them, we feel perfectly safe in denying. That heat, and perhaps other forms of energy or force, may be taken up and employed by the agent—"mysterious agent"—whose instrument the brain is, that they may be raised to a higher plane, (not raise themselves,) be used and let down again, all "in some mysterious way," there can be no doubt. Under what conditions this can be done we propose to consider in a future essay. That there is a difficulty here—nay, even a mystery—we freely admit; but that it is solved by the method of Professor Barker we deny.

---

* See our book-notice of Prof. Tyndall.—Ed.

In this somewhat lengthy extract the evidence is summed up by the Professor of Physiological Chemistry in Yale College that "demonstrates" that "thought force" "is the converted energy of burning carbon." Moreover, the brain "is a machine" for accomplishing this conversion. The evidence of this is so strong as to lead the Professor to ask with inquisitive surprise, "Can we longer refuse to believe?" etc. After such an array of "facts," is it possible that any one can be found who has "such an overwhelming bias," as Mr. Spencer would say, as to refuse to fall into line?

This evidence may be reduced to the single head of animal heat produced during nervous action, the same apparently as we have seen during muscular action.* In certain states, or during certain acts, say of an emotional nature, more heat appears than during some others not so highly emotional, or attended by less muscular exercise. It seems, then, we may notice in passing, we do not speak amiss when we say of an emotional nature, "it is warm."

That this production of heat during mental action, whether emotional or not, interesting fact as it is, indicates some relation, and probably one that is quite "intimate," between physical or chemical force and thought or emotion, there need be no question. But that these facts warrant us in asserting, least of all prove, a correlation between physical force and "thought force," whatever it may be, we fail entirely see. To assert a relation is one thing, to assert a correlation is quite another. We doubt not that "in some mysterious way" physical force and "thought force" are related. But that there is any evidence that warrants the conclusion that these forces are now related in the sense claimed for them, we feel perfectly safe in denying. That heat, and perhaps other forms of energy or force, may be taken up and employed by the agent—"psychic agent"—whose instrument the brain is, that they may be raised to a higher plane, (not raise themselves,) be used and let down again, all "in some mysterious way," there can be no doubt. Under what conditions this can be done we propose to consider in a future essay. That there is a difficulty here—nay, even a mystery—we freely admit; but that it is solved by the method of Professor Barker we deny.

---

* See our last notice of Prof. Tyndall.—Ed.

What fact has Professor Barker given that can be compared at all to those by which the mutual conversion of the physical and chemical forces is established? He simply reminds us of the nervous structure, and that food goes as blood into this structure called brain, that it is decomposed there, that some of the energy or force stored up in it is set free in the form of heat, but not enough to account for all the energy that must have been set free. This residuum of energy which has disappeared from our view it is presumed is converted into "thought force"—we say presumed, not proved—but how, we have nothing save conjecture to tell us. The very point we wait to see established is the unmistakable conversion, direct or indirect, of physical into mental force. This much has been promised us, and this alone will satisfy us. The mere *dictum* of no man or set of men is sufficient, however learned or scientific they may be. We await the proofs. The sole case that it seems to us can give even a coloring of probability to the view we are now examining is that set forth in the essay of Dr. Carpenter. It will form a topic of our next article.

That in the working of the brain, as the instrument of the mind, physical energy is in some way really necessary, and that it undergoes some kind of transformation, there need be no question. But that we must or can conclude, from any thing known, that heat, for example, is converted into the energy of mind, is simply preposterous, even on logical grounds.

Art. II.—THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN AND ITS LITERATURE.

Books Published by John Dickins, No. 50 North Second-street, near Arch-street, Philadelphia. For the Use of the Methodist Societies in the United States of America. 1795.

List of Publications of the Methodist Book Concern, April, 1871. New York: Carlton & Lanahan, Agents. Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis: Hitchcock & Walden, Agents. San Francisco, California: E. Thomas, Agent.

On our table lies a *fac-simile*, received from the hand of Dr. Carlton, of the first catalogue of books for the use of the Methodists in this country. It is a curiosity—a single leaf, six and a half inches long by three and three fourths wide. It contains a

What fact has Professor Barker given that can be compared at all to those by which the mutual convertibility of the physical and chemical forces is established? He simply reminds us of the nervous structure, and that food goes as blood into this structure called brain; that it is decomposed there, that some of the energy or force stored up in it is set free in the form of heat, but not enough to account for all the energy that must have been set free. This residuum of energy which has disappeared from our view, it is presumed, is converted into "thought force"—we say presumed, not proved—but how, we have nothing save conjecture to tell us. The very point we wait to see established is the unmistakable conversion, direct or indirect, of physical into mental force. This which has been promised us, and this alone will satisfy us. The mere dictum of no man or set of men is sufficient, however learned or scientific they may be. We await the proofs. The sole case that it seems to us can give even a coloring of probability to the view we are now examining is that set forth in the essay of Dr. Carpenter. It will form a topic of our next article.

That in the working of the brain, as the instrument of the mind, physical energy is in some way really necessary, and that it undergoes some kind of transformation, there need be no question. But that we know or can conclude, from anything known, that heat, for example, is converted into the energy of mind, is simply preposterous, even on logical grounds.

ART. II.—THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN AND ITS LITERATURE.

[illegible] For the Use of the Methodist Societies in the United States of America. 1789.

[illegible] New York: [illegible] Agents. Cincinnati: [illegible] Agents. San Francisco: [illegible] E. Thomas, Agent.

On our table lies a *fac simile*, received from the hand of Dr. Carlton, of the first catalogue of books for the use of the Methodists in this country. It is a curiosity—a single leaf, six and a half inches long by three and three fourths wide. It contains a list of twenty-eight books and pamphlets, among which are Wesley's Notes on the New Testament, his Journals, Sermons, and other smaller treatises; The Works of Rev. J. Fletcher, The Arminian Magazine, The Form of Discipline for 1792, "with Treatises on Predestination, Perseverance, Christian Perfection, Baptism, *et al*, all bound together;" The Experience and Travels of Freeborn Garrettson; certain devotional treatises by Thomas à Kempis, Doddridge, Baxter, Law, Mrs. Rowe; a Pocket Hymn-Book, Tracts on Baptism and Slavery, Catechism for Children, and a few other books.

When first the cry of ignorance and of opposition to education and a learned ministry was being sedulously raised by "the Standing Order" against the Methodists in this country, Rev. John Dickins was publishing, and Methodist preachers were circulating as widely as possible, such a literature as the times demanded, not more for the dissemination and the defense of an Arminian theology than for the exposition and spread of a sound and unsectarian evangelism, which should become, as history has vindicated, an inspiration to enlarged intelligence and religious education. "We greatly mistake if we suppose the Methodist ministry, even then, to have been always uneducated. Some brought a large store of literature and theological knowledge with them into the itinerant field. Amid all their toils and privations they found time for mental improvement, and became quite respectable in their knowledge of science and of letters."* In the field of popular controversy they were unsurpassed. Shrewdness, knowledge of men, and familiarity with the Scriptures were prominent. Then, as it is now, the book business was conducted by all parties as a religious enterprise, the profits of which were devoted to "the general benefit of the Methodist societies."

The second catalogue mentioned above is a royal octavo volume of sixty-five pages, a monument of the enterprise of the ministry, an honor to the Church, and a masterly defense, among others, of the general intelligence, literary character, and reading tastes and habits of her people. An examination of these two catalogues shows, that two of the most prominent features of American Methodism are her use of the press and her institutions of learning for the promotion of sound religious

---

* Dr. Z. Paddock's Semi-Centennial Sermon, 1868.

education and practical intelligence. Her "Book Concern" is second to no religious publishing house in the world, and for business reputation it is inferior to no other book establishment in America. Having its headquarters in the chief commercial city, it has extensive co-ordinate departments in Cincinnati and San Francisco, flourishing branches in Chicago and St. Louis, and successful depositories in Boston, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Detroit. In some of these, and in other convenient centers, is published a varied periodical literature in the form of quarterlies, monthlies, semi-monthlies, and weeklies, all under the direction and patronage of the Church. In order to sustain these great and varied enterprises the rank and file of the denomination must be a reading, if not a very literary, people.

It is not claimed that all the books enumerated in these catalogues are written by Methodists, for it is a peculiarity of this Church—as it is of Christianity to subdue all things unto *itself* —to subsidize every thing available within the area of religious literature to the interests, intelligence, and piety of her people. Neither are they all the productions of American minds, for Methodism is a grand unit in fundamental doctrines and usages, as it is in spirit and aims. Though not an ecumenical hierarchy, and it is hoped never will be, however high-sounding it may seem to some, yet its "parish is the world." The standard works of European theologians are, therefore, quite as available and readable among us as at home. Neither, on the other hand, do these catalogues contain by far all the books of real worth and popularity which have been written by our own authors. Larger and smaller treatises in the fields of science, in general literature, as also in theology, are, for obvious reasons, published at other houses; while some essayists, preferring to control the sale and receive the profits of their productions, take the entire responsibility of the publishing, though they secure the imprint and moral patronage of some well-known house.

Considering the recent date of American Methodism, the embarrassments of her early history, and the demands on her chief scholars and ministers in her schools and in the pastoral offices—greater, perhaps, than in any other denomination—no Church, probably, has produced more or better writers, nor a education and practical intelligence. The "Book Concern" is second to no religious publishing house in the world, and for business reputation it is inferior to no other book establishment in America. Having its headquarters in the chief commercial city, it has extensive co-ordinate departments in Cincinnati and San Francisco, flourishing branches in Chicago and St. Louis, and successful depositories in Boston, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Detroit. In some of these, and in other convenient centers, is published a varied periodical literature in the form of quarterlies, monthlies, semi-monthlies and weeklies, all under the direction and patronage of the Church. In order to sustain these great and varied enterprises the rank and file of the denomination must be a reading, if not a very literary, people.

It is not claimed that all the books enumerated in these catalogues are written by Methodists, for it is a peculiarity of this Church—as it is of Christianity to subdue all things unto itself—to subsidize everything available within the area of religious literature to the interests, intelligence, and piety of her people. Neither are they all the productions of American minds, for Methodism is a grand unit in fundamental doctrines and usages, as it is in spirit and aims. Though not an ecumenical hierarchy, and it is hoped never will be, however high sounding it may seem to some, yet it is "Catholic in the world." The standard works of European theologians are, therefore, quite as available and readable among us as at home. Neither, on the other hand, do these catalogues contain by far all the books of real worth and popularity which have been written by our own authors. Larger and smaller treatises in the fields of science, in general literature, as also in theology, are, for obvious reasons, published at other houses; while some essayists, preferring to control the sale and receive the profits of their productions, take the entire responsibility of the publishing, though they secure the imprint and moral patronage of some well-known house.

Considering the recent date of American Methodism, the embarrassments of her early history, and the demands on her chief scholars and ministers in her schools and in the pastoral offices—greater, perhaps, than in any other denomination—no Church, probably, has produced more or better writers, for a greater number of creditable scholars. The catalogues of the chief publishing houses in this country, a look at the twenty-seven colleges with their two hundred and twenty professors, and the sixty-nine seminaries of learning owned by, or under the special patronage of, the Conferences, and a glance at the theological schools and State Universities manned by our men, furnish evidence of the number and character of our educators and authors. For the sake of a somewhat comprehensive idea of the publishing enterprise of the Church, we give an outline, in the following classification, of the chief and more widely circulated books:

In the range of CHURCH HISTORY, general and denominational, are at least sixteen important works that bear the imprint of our Book Agents; among which are Ruter's Church History, Annals of the Church, Bangs's Original Church of Christ, Apostolical Succession, Brand of Dominic, King's Primitive Church, Vaudois Church, Hagenbach's Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, the very learned volumes entitled Sacred Annals by Dr. George Smith, and Carter's History of the Reformation, all which make a complete range of ecclesiastical history. Of those having a *denominational* character are the elegantly written and eminently philosophical Histories of Methodism, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of Methodism in New England, by Dr. A. Stevens; the earlier History by Dr. N. Bangs, the Defense of Methodist Episcopacy by Bishop Emory, and the Lost Chapters by Dr. Wakeley.

The field of BIOGRAPHY is still more extensive, embracing the lives of about seventy-five persons more or less prominent in English and American Methodism, such as the Wesleys, Watson, A. Clarke, Fletcher, Benson, Coke, Asbury, Abbott, Bangs, Collins, Emory, Finley, Garrettson, Gruber, Hedding, Ware, Fisk, Hamline, Roberts, and the autobiographies of Boehm, Cartwright, and of others—making a full gallery of varied and instructive portraitures.

In the range of APOLOGETIC AND CONTROVERSIAL publications are the learned and versatile works of Dr. Joseph Butler, Bishop Watson, Fletcher, Tulloch, Hodgson, Leslie, Whateley, Elliott, Foster, Alexander, Mattison, George W. Clarke, Larrabee, Fisk—all on widely different and yet important matters

in defense of Christianity and in reply to infidel authors, as also in defense of Arminian theology.

In COMMENTARIES Methodism furnishes standard works by Dr. A. Clarke, Benson, Wesley, and Watson. In addition to these we are proud to notice the not less learned and critical expositions of Drs. Whedon and Nast, which, because they are quite up to the advances of modern science, of criticism, and of monumental theology, are more fully and better adapted to these times. Then we have the minor Notes by Longking and Peirce, Denton on the Lord's Prayer, Dr. Hibbard's valuable and historical work on the Psalms, Strong's Harmony and Exposition, an Exposition and Harmony of the Gospels on the "Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ" by Dr. D. D. Buck, Carroll's Notes, Moody's New Testament, and Parables Explained by Bourdillon—a list of which no Church need be ashamed.

In the field of TRAVEL we have Drs. Durbin and Olin, Bishops Thomson and Kingsley, and Domestic Life in Palestine by Miss Rogers.

In the range of BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND CRITICISM the "Concern" publishes Townley, Birks's Bible and Modern Thought, Horne's and Sutcliffe's Introductions to the Study of the Bible, Clarke's Sacred Literature, Trail's Literary Characteristics and Achievements of the Bible, Fairbairn on Prophecy, and other smaller but useful treatises.

In defense of our DENOMINATIONAL POLITY, and in illustration and confirmation of our DOCTRINES AND USAGES, are treatises on the Discipline by Bishops Hedding, Emory, Morris, and Baker; on the Polity of the Church by Drs. Bond, Stevens, and Mattison; and on the Doctrines and Usages of the Church are volumes, widely different in their character and style, by Drs. Porter, Reddy, and Hawley, which are sufficiently definite to meet the inquiries of all.

The ORDINANCES OF BAPTISM and the LORD'S SUPPER are severally and exhaustively treated—the latter by Drs. A. Clarke and S. Luckey, the former by Drs. Hibbard, Slicer, and Shaffer, and others.

On the great theme of the Church, not "the central idea," but the consummative idea and fact of Christianity, namely, HOLINESS, OR CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, are the treatises by in defence of Christianity and in reply to infidel authors, as also in defence of Arminian theology.

In Commentaries Methodism furnishes standard works by Dr. A. Clarke, Benson, Wesley, and Watson. In addition to these we are proud to notice the not less learned and critical expositions of Drs. Whedon and Nast, which, because they are quite up to the advances of modern science, of criticism, and of sacramental theology, are more fully and better adapted to these times. Then we have the minor Notes by Longking and Peirce, Dunton on the Lord's Prayer, Dr. Hibbard's valuable and historical work on the Psalms, Strong's Harmony and Exposition, an Exposition and Harmony of the Gospels on the "Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ" by Dr. D. D. Buck, Carroll's Notes, Mosely's New Testament, and Parables Explained by Rounditon—a list of which no Church need be ashamed.

In the field of Travel we have Drs. Durbin and Olin, Bishops Thomson and Kingsley, and Domestic Life in Palestine by Miss Rogers.

In the range of Biblical Literature and Criticism the "Chautauqua" publishes Townley, Birks's Bible and Modern Thought, Harman's and Stockton's Introductions to the Study of the Bible, Clarke's Sacred Chronology, Tefft's Literary Characteristics and Achievements of the Bible, Fairbairn on Prophecy, and other smaller but useful treatises.

In defense of our Denominational Polity, and in illustration and maintenance of our Doctrines and Usages, are treatises on the Discipline by Bishops Hedding, Emory, Morris, and Baker; on the Polity of the Church by Drs. Bond, Stevens, and Matthews; and on the Doctrines and Usages of the Church are volumes widely different in their character and style by Drs. Foster, Reddy, and Hurley, which are sufficiently definite to meet the inquiries of all.

The Ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are severally and exhaustively treated—the latter by Drs. A. Clarke and S. Tuckey, the former by Drs. Hibbard, Sleeg, and Shedd, and others.

On the great theme of the Church, not "the central idea," but the consummative idea and fact of Christianity—namely, Holiness, or Christian Perfection, are the treatises by

Wesley and Fletcher—standard among us—and other more elaborate works by Drs. Peck, R. S. Foster, Bangs, and Merritt. The writings of Mrs. Dr. Palmer, which have an extensive sale and exert a wide influence for good among all evangelical denominations, are kept on sale by the Concern.

Closing this classification we are pleased to notice the noble catholicity of the establishment in issuing a number of modern and popular works, without compromising the theological reputation of the house, written by some of the ablest European scholars and divines, on a wide range of subjects, and in gathering up the writings of some of our now ablest men, and giving them to the people. Of this class we name the Works of Bishop Hamline, Drs. Dempster, Elliott, Fisk, Olin, and Floy, Whedon on the Will, Hurst on Rationalism, of M. Ernest Naville on the Problem of Evil, Bierbower's Philosophy, Cocker's Christianity and Greek Philosophy, Works of Bishops Morris and Clarke, *et al.*

> The literary and scientific tendencies of the present age have given birth to a new species of infidelity, or rather, to infidelity under a new guise. Less gross, vulgar, and repulsive in its aspect than formerly, but, perhaps, still more dangerous in its ultimate tendencies, it has sought to make some of the more important branches of the natural sciences tributary to its unholy purposes. It is maintained that the facts of geology are inconsistent with the Mosaic history of creation, and that the science of astronomy can never be made to quadrate with the New Testament account of the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ. Some, even under the garb of reverence for the Bible and adherence to Christianity, have aimed deadly blows against the records of our faith. Colenso is a bishop of the Church of England; Carlyle, Parker, and Emerson profess respect for the Christian religion, and yet these men, with others of kindred character, are pursuing a course calculated, if not designed, to subvert the Christian system.*

In order to meet these things we have the Meditations of Guizot, the Early Church and the Life of Christ by Pressensé, Romance of Renan by Drs. Schaff and Roussel, Dr. C. H. Fowler on Colenso, the Essays of Drs. Warren, Newhall, and Haven on Parkerism, and then, though published elsewhere, the versatile and popular Credo by Dr. Townsend, making, together with a succinct treatise on the Origin and Progress of Language, satisfactory refutations of Renan, Straus, and their

---

* Dr. Z. Paddock's Semi-Centennial Sermon, 1868.

Wesley and Fletcher—standard among us—and other more elaborate works by Drs. Peck, R. S. Foster, Bangs, and Merrick. The writings of Mrs. Dr. Palmer, which have an extensive sale and exert a wide influence for good among all evangelical denominations, are kept on sale by the Concern.

Closing this classification we are pleased to notice the noble catholicity of the establishment in issuing a number of modern and popular works, without compromising the theological reputation of the house, written by some of the ablest European scholars and divines, on a wide range of subjects, and in gathering up the writings of some of our own ablest men, and giving them to the people. Of this class we name the Works of Bishop Hamline, Drs. Dempster, Elliott, Fisk, Olin, and Floy, Whedon on the Will, Hurst on Rationalism, of M. Ernest Naville on the Problem of Evil, Bledsoe's Philosophy, Cocker's Christianity and Greek Philosophy, Works of Bishops Morris and Clarke, *et al.*

The literary and scientific tendencies of the present age have given birth to a new species of infidelity, or rather, to infidelity under a new guise. Less gross, vulgar, and repulsive in its aspects than formerly, but, perhaps, not more dangerous in its ultimate tendencies, it has sought to make some of the more important branches of the natural sciences tributary to its unholy purposes. It is maintained that the facts of geology are inconsistent with the Mosaic history of creation, and that the science of astronomy can never be made to quadrate with the New Testament account of the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ. Some, even under the garb of reverence for the Bible and adherence to Christianity, have aimed deadly blows against the records of our faith. Colenso is a bishop of the Church of England. Carlyle, Parker, and Emerson profess respect for the Christian religion, and yet these men, with others of kindred character, are pursuing a course calculated, if not designed, to subvert the Christian system.*

In order to meet these things we have the Meditations of Guizot, the Early Church and the Life of Christ by Pressensé, [illegible] of Reason by Drs. Schaff and Ramsey, Dr. C. H. Fowler on Colenso, the Essays of Drs. Warren, Marshall, and Haven on Positivism, and then, though published elsewhere, the versatile and popular Credo by Dr. Townsend, making, together with a luminous treatise on the Origin and Progress of Language, satisfactory refutations of Renan, Strauss, and their disciples. In this department of literature we should not fail to notice the "Methodist Quarterly Review," especially under the keen and searching scalpel of the editor—to whom we presonally owe as much as to any other man—as keeping up with the times.[*]

---

* Dr. E. Thomson's Semi-Centennial Sermon, 1866.

Of the six hundred volumes in the general catalogue, two hundred and sixty odd are from the pens of American Methodist authors, besides the twenty-two volumes published elsewhere but kept on sale and approved by the authorities of the Church. In addition to these, and to meet the demands of a completely organized and vigorously working Church, the Agents, who are the representatives and servants of the entire itinerant ministry, or of the General Conference, publish Pronouncing Bibles, Hymn Books, Music Books, Church Requisites, Preachers' and Sunday-school Requisites in great variety, for the completeness of organization, for the accuracy of records, and for doing a systematic business in every department of local Churches.

The PERIODICAL LITERATURE, under the same general supervision, the proceeds of which, as well as of the book department, go to sustain the various interests of the Church, is in itself a marvel. The "Quarterly Review," having the largest circulation, and thought by competent judges to be the most ably conducted of any similar work in this country, has reached its fifty-fourth volume. The "Ladies' Repository"—the "Queen of Monthlies"—solid, rich, and instructive, has a circulation of not less than thirty thousand copies. The "Christian Advocate" family, nine in number, together with "Zion's Herald," "Christian Apologist," and the "Sandebudet," reach a large proportion of our families. The "Sunday-School Journal," for teachers and older scholars, the "Golden disciples. In the department of literature, we should not fail to notice the "*Methodist Quarterly Review*," especially under the keen and searching study of the editor—to whom we personally owe as much as to any other man—as keeping up with the times.*

---

[*] In addition to the classified list given in the text, we call particular attention to the following late and valuable volumes as showing the enterprise of the Concern under the management of the General Editor and the Agent having charge of the literary department, namely: Apostolic Era, Mystery of Suffering, and Religion and Reign of Terror by Dr. Pressensé; Arts of Intoxication, by Dr. Crane; Bible Geography, by Professor Whitney; Bible Hand-Book, by Dr. Holliday; Life of Chalmers, by James Dodds; Washington Irving, by Dr. Adams; Living Words, by Dr. M'Clintock; Misread Passages of Scripture, by J. B. Brown; Oriental Missions, by Bishop Thomson; Round the World, by Bishop Kingsley; Romanism, by Dr. Mattison; Sermons, by Dr. Hamilton.

Of the six hundred volumes in the general catalogue, two hundred and sixty odd are from the pens of American Methodist authors; besides the twenty-two volumes published elsewhere but kept on sale and approved by the authorities of the Church. In addition to these, and to meet the demands of a completely organized and vigorously working Church, the Agents, who are the representatives and servants of the entire itinerant ministry, as of the General Conference, publish Pronouncing Bibles, Hymn Books, Music Books, Church Registers, Preachers' and Sunday-school Registers in great variety, for the completeness of organization, for the accuracy of records, and for doing a systematic business in every department of local Churches.

The PERIODICAL LITERATURE, under the same general supervision, the proceeds of which, as well as of the book department, go to sustain the various interests of the Church, is in itself a marvel. The "*Quarterly Review*," having the largest circulation, and thought by competent judges to be the most ably conducted of any similar work in this country, has reached its fifty-fourth volume. The "*Ladies' Repository*"—the "*Queen of Monthlies*"—solid, rich, and instructive, has a circulation of not less than thirty thousand copies. The "*Christian Advocate*" family, nine in number, together with "*Zion's Herald*," "*Christian Apologist*," and the "*Sandbote*," reach a large proportion of our families. The "*Sunday-School Journal*," for teachers and older scholars, the "*Golden*

---

* In addition to the statistics given in the text, we call particular attention to the following late and valuable volumes as showing the enterprise of the Concern under the management of the General Editor and the Agent having charge of the [illegible] department, namely: [illegible] and [illegible] by Dr. [illegible]; Arts of Intoxication, by Dr. Crane; Life [illegible] by Professor [illegible]; [illegible] by Dr. [illegible]; Life of [illegible] by [illegible]; [illegible]; Living Words, by Dr. M'Clintock; [illegible] by [illegible]; [illegible] by Bishop Thomson; Round the World, by Bishop Kingsley; [illegible] by Dr. [illegible]; Sermons, by Dr. Hamline.

Hours," for boys and girls, the "Sunday-School Advocate," which has an average circulation of three hundred thousand copies, the seventy-two thousand copies of the "Good News," published in the interest of the tract cause, and the "Missionary Advocate," for gratuitous distribution to every family in the Church, make a grand total the equal of which is not found in any other Church on the globe. For the sake of the Churches among other nationalities, many of the publications—we mean of books, periodicals, and tracts—are in the German, Danish, Swedish, Welsh, and French languages.

After this survey we turn to the SUNDAY-SCHOOL department, consisting of Registries, Catechisms, Question Books, Manuals, Helps for Teachers, Notes, and books of general instruction, Hymns and Music, Maps, Cards, Certificates, and Rewards, in varieties sufficient to satisfy the most fastidious or critical. The libraries are not less extensive nor varied in style, matter, and topics than seems necessary to meet the demands and tastes of all parties. Under the commendable energy, managing ability, and good taste of Drs. Kidder, Wise, and Vincent, the resources of this department have reached the aggregate of twelve hundred and fifty volumes, which number is enriched by selections from the general catalogue for the Adult, Young People's, and Home Libraries. For the convenience of adaptation and selection these books are arranged into Children's Libraries, Series A and B, and Youth's Library. We suggest a further classification, made according to the general character and topics, into books of Travel, Biography, History, Geography, Science, Stories, and so on. This would facilitate the work of selecting according to the demands of taste and needed variety in the several schools.

The last item in this general survey is the department of TRACT LITERATURE, which embraces one thousand single tracts on as many different topics, reaching to more than seven thousand pages. According to the Seventeenth Annual Report there were printed under the auspices of this society for the year 1869, the grand total of 37,765,234 pages of tract matter. For the convenience of selecting any style or character of tract they are not only numbered, but put up in packages according to topics and general characteristics.

From all of these items, which we gather from authentic

Hours," for boys and girls, the "Sunday-School Advocate," which has an average circulation of three hundred thousand copies, the seventy-two thousand copies of the "Good News," published in the interest of the tract cause, and the "Missionary Advocate," for gratuitous distribution to every family in the Church, make a grand total the equal of which is not found in any other Church on the globe. For the sake of the Churches among other nationalities, many of the publications—we mean of books, periodicals, and tracts—are in the German, Danish, Swedish, Welsh, and French languages.

After this survey we turn to the SUNDAY-SCHOOL department, consisting of Registries, Catechisms, Question Books, Manuals, Helps for Teachers, Notes, and books of general instruction, Hymns and Music, Maps, Cards, Certificates, and Rewards, in varieties sufficient to satisfy the most fastidious or critical. The libraries are not less extensive nor varied in style, matter, and topics than seems necessary to meet the demands and tastes of all parties. Under the commendable energy, managing ability, and good taste of Drs. Kidder, Wise, and Vincent, the resources of this department have reached the aggregate of twelve hundred and fifty volumes, which number is enriched by selections from the general catalogue for the Adult, Young People's, and Home Libraries. For the convenience of adaptation and selection these books are arranged into Children's Libraries, Series A and B, and Youth's Library. We suggest a further classification, made according to the general character and topics, into books of Travel, Biography, History, Geography, Science, Stories, and so on. This would facilitate the work of selecting according to the demands of taste and needed variety in the several schools.

The last item in this general survey is the department of TRACT LITERATURE, which embraces one thousand single tracts on as many different topics, reaching to more than seven thousand pages. According to the Seventeenth *Annual Report* there were printed under the auspices of this society for the year 1872, the grand total of 37,785,234 pages of tract matter. For the convenience of selecting any style or character of tract they are not only numbered, but put up in packages according to topics and general characteristics.

From all of these items, which we gather from authentic reports of the several departments, our readers will see what a mammoth and complicated enterprise the Book Agents, assisted by the heads, officers, clerks, and book-keepers, have in charge. Prominent among those who by their superb business talents have aided largely in building up the Concern to its present position are Drs. Bangs, Emory, Waugh, Lane, and Carlton, (the last named will have been next May twenty years in his position,) and the editors of the general books, particularly Drs. Peck, M'Clintock, and Whedon. That mistakes have been made is no marvel, for "to err is human." That losses have occurred is no more than arises from the liabilities of all business. That frauds have been perpetrated remains unproved. That the business has been the most successfully conducted possible, is not claimed. That the most rigid economy compatible with the best interests of the establishment, with its reputation among other and competing houses, and with the tastes of all its patrons, has always been practiced we cannot affirm. Indeed it has long seemed to us that the smaller and more ephemeral sheets, those which are laid aside after the first reading, are too costly both in the quality of the paper used and in the elegance of the cuts. Were they very generally bound for preservation, this were well. But it is seldom in these days of profuse literature that the sheets referred to are long preserved. And yet in this matter we are not disposed to criticise. We do not know all the facts which control the publishers and editors. That immense profits have accrued is shown by the accumulation of capital, the enlargement of business, and by the disbursements made to the legal corporators and beneficiaries of the Concern, as shown by the reports made to the General and Annual Conferences. These profits are turned in, by direction of the General Conference, to enlarge the business, to strengthen weak enterprises in the literary departments, to otherwise foster the Church, and to pay the salaries of the bishops. Whether the prices of our books and periodicals should be put down to the lowest point possible, in competition with other and unchurchly houses, and for the sake of circulating a very cheap literature, does not come within the design or scope of this paper. It would require an examination into the comparative quality of paper and illustrations used, the style of binding, and particularly into the demand for, reports of the several departments, our readers will see what a mammoth and complicated enterprise the Book Agents, assisted by the heads, officers, clerks, and book-keepers, have in charge. Prominent among those who by their superb business talents have aided largely in building up the Concern to its present position are Drs. Bangs, Emory, Waugh, Lane, and Carlton, (the last named will have been near twenty years in his position,) and the editors of the general books, particularly Drs. Peck, M'Clintock, and Whedon. That mistakes have been made is no marvel, for "to err is human." That losses have occurred is no more than arises from the liabilities of all business. That frauds have been perpetrated remains unproved. That the business has been the most successfully conducted possible, is not claimed. That the most rigid economy compatible with the best interests of the establishment, with its reputation among other and competing houses, and with the tastes of all its patrons, has always been practiced we cannot affirm. Indeed it has long seemed to us that the smaller and more ephemeral books, those which are laid aside after the first reading, are too costly both in the quality of the paper used and in the elegance of the cuts. Were they very generally bound for preservation, this were well. But it is seldom in these days of profuse literature that the essays referred to are long preserved. And yet in this matter we are not disposed to criticise. We do not know all the facts which control the publishers and editors. That immense profits have accrued is shown by the accumulation of capital, the enlargement of business, and by the disbursements made to the legal recipients and beneficiaries of the Concern, as shown by the reports made to the General and Annual Conferences. These profits are turned in, by direction of the General Conference, to enlarge the business, to strengthen weak enterprises in the literary departments, to subsidize them for the Church, and to pay the salaries of the bishops. Whether the prices of our books and periodicals should be put down to the lowest point possible, in competition with other and uncharitable houses, and for the sake of circulating a very cheap literature, does not come within the design or scope of this paper. It would require an examination into the comparative quality of paper and illustrations used, the style of binding, and particularly into the demand for, and saleability of, religious and theological books. It would call for a consideration of the mooted point whether a religious publishing house, under the direction and in the interest of a great connectional Church, should be conducted on the principle of making the largest dividends to its beneficiaries named in the sixth Restrictive Rule, or whether it is not better that, under the direction of the highest authorities and chief guardians, it shall be made to subserve the literary and reading interests of the whole Church by aiding weak enterprises, where periodicals and book depositories should be established and maintained, as, for instance, at local centers far away from the metropolis. It involves further the question, whether the proceeds of the Concern should, to any extent, be applied to the payment of the salaries of our bishops, and to the meeting of any deficiency in the expenses of the General Conference. To the writer it is clear that the present arrangement is better than an attempt to raise an Episcopal endowment, or than to add the support of the bishops to the many public collections now brought before our congregations.* Because of the push and enterprise of our entire spirit and system, no Church and saleability of, religious and theological books. It would call for a consideration of the mooted point, whether a religious publishing house, under the direction and in the interest of a great connectional Church, should be conducted on the principle of making the largest dividends to the beneficiaries named in the sixth Restrictive Rule, or whether it is not better that, under the direction of the highest authorities and wisest guardians, it shall be made to subserve the literary and reading interests of the whole Church by aiding weak enterprises, where periodicals and book depositories should be established and maintained, as, for instance, at local centres far away from the metropolis. It involves further the question, whether the proceeds of the Concern should, to any extent, be applied to the payment of the salaries of our bishops, and to the meeting of any deficiency in the expenses of the General Conference. To the writer it is clear that the present arrangement is better than an attempt to raise an Episcopal endowment, or than to add the support of the bishops to the many public collections now brought before our congregations.* Because of the push and enterprise of our entire spirit and system, no Church has so many of these collections as we have. Methodist episcopacy not being diocesan, but a general superintendency, it cannot easily or adequately be endowed. We are too progressive, and at the same time enlarging, a connection for this.

---

* The experiment made in this direction by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, does not encourage a similar attempt with us. The official report made in May, 1871, as given in the "Christian Advocate," June 15, 1871, is as follows: "The collections for the support of the bishops lack $4,471 of meeting the aggregate claim allowed. Five Conferences have passed their assessment in full, six have paid above the sum assessed, while twenty-three have failed to collect the amount apportioned to them." Though we think well of the suggestion to divide the Conferences into episcopal or "residential" districts, within which the bishops shall reside, and doubt not that the cities selected would build and furnish the residences, yet we think the present plan of using the profits of the Concern for cheapening the publications, for enlarging the business, for supplying necessary deficiencies in other departments, *and for meeting the salaries of the bishops, to be the better one.* It is, at least, the result of long and mature experience, and seems more becoming the character, dignity, and position of the episcopate than to make further experiment, until the laity shall have the opportunity of speaking in the General Conference.

To make the bishops dependent, as is further suggested, in part on Church collections, in part on voluntary gifts of the wealthy, and then, for any deficiency, on the Book Concern, is to make our chief pastors subject to greater contingencies and greater complications than are other officers or ministers. But should their support, like that of presiding elders and pastors, be thrown upon the people, and then be apportioned, on some equitable plan, to the Conferences, to the districts, and to the congregations, we think it would be adequately met. Their residences, at well-selected centers within episcopal districts, would constitute a large part of the salaries.

---

* The experiment made in this direction by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, does not encourage a similar attempt with us. The official report made in May, 1871, as given in the "Christian Advocate," June 15, 1871, is as follows: "The collections for the support of the bishops lack $5,473 of meeting the appropriations allowed. Five Conferences have raised their assessment in full, or have paid above the sum assessed, while twenty-three have failed to collect the amount apportioned to them." Though we think well of the suggestion to divide the Conferences into episcopal or "residential" districts, within which the bishops shall reside, and doubt not that the cities selected would build and furnish the residences, yet we think the present plan of using the profits of the Concern for compensating the proprietors for enlarging the business, for supplying necessary deficiencies in other departments, and for meeting the salaries of the bishops, is the better one. It is, at least, the result of long and mature experience, and seems more becoming the character, dignity, and position of the episcopacy than to make further experiments, until the laity shall have the opportunity of speaking in the General Conference.

To make the bishops dependent, as is further suggested, in part on Church collections, in part on voluntary gifts of the wealthy, and then, for any deficiency, on the Book Concern, is to make our chief pastors subject to greater mortifications and greater complications than are other officers or ministers. But should their salaries, like that of presiding elders and pastors, be thrown upon the people and then be apportioned, on some equitable plan, to the Conferences, to the districts, and to the congregations, we think it should be adopted at once. Their residences, at well-selected centres within episcopal districts, would constitute a large part of the salaries.

Now the denominational genius which inspires to this great and varied work, and the enterprise which pushes it on to such grand and enlarging proportions, are in part inherited from the founders and early promoters of Methodism, many of whom were scholars and far-seeing men. We need but to read the portraitures of the early English Methodists, as drawn by Dr. A. Stevens in his elegantly written History, and then again to study the struggles of the leading minds of the American Church, from Coke and Asbury down through Bangs, Ruter, Fisk, Olin, and others to the present—we have but to read and study these men and their deeds, in order to see that the old fires of sanctified intelligence, learning, scholarship, and literature continue to burn in the Church, and, judging from the past, will continue to glow until her missions shall end—nay, not *end*, for the achievements of sanctified intelligence will never end.

The Book Concern was begun by Rev. John Dickins in Philadelphia, 1789, where he was stationed by Bishop Asbury in 1785. Mr. Dickins was, for the times, a notable man. Born in London, he studied at Eton College, emigrated to America before the Revolution, joined the Methodists in 1774, traveled extensively in Virginia and North Carolina, was engaged in the first project for a literary institution among us—which resulted in Cokesbury College—was stationed at John-street, New York, in 1783, and has the honor of founding the Concern of which we write. He is said to have been an able preacher and a good scholar. To have originated and successfully carried forward for a time, on a capital of *six hundred dollars*, the nucleus of this establishment, he must have possessed good business talents. Not on his own motion did he engage in this work, but was designated to it as "Book Steward" in connection with his regular ministerial work.* The first "Book Committee" was appointed in 1799. In 1804 the Concern was removed to New York. In 1836 it was consumed by fire, but

* Stevens's History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, vol. ii, pp. 41, 499.

has so many of these collections as we have. Methodist episcopacy not being diocesan, but a general superintendency, it cannot easily or adequately be followed. We are too progressive, and at the same time enlarging, a connection for this.

Now the denominational genius which inspires to this great and varied work, and the enterprise which pushes it on to such grand and enlarging proportions, are in part inherited from the founders and early promoters of Methodism, many of whom were scholars and far-seeing men. We need but to read the portraitures of the early English Methodists, as drawn by Dr. A. Stevens in his elegantly written History, and then again to study the struggles of the leading minds of the American Church, from Coke and Asbury down through Bangs, Emory, Fisk, Olin, and others to the present—we have but to read and study these men and their deeds, in order to see that the old fires of consecrated intelligence, learning, scholarship, and literature continue to burn in the Church, and, judging from the past, will continue to glow until her mission shall end—nay, not end, for the achievements of sanctified intelligence will never end.

The Book Concern was begun by Rev. John Dickins in Philadelphia, 1789, where he was stationed by Bishop Asbury in 1788. Mr. Dickins was, for the times, a notable man. Born in London, he studied at Eton College, emigrated to America before the Revolution, joined the Methodists in 1774, traveled extensively in Virginia and North Carolina, was engaged in the first project for a literary institution among us—which resulted in Cokesbury College—was stationed at John street, New York, in 1783, and has the honor of founding the Concern of which we write. He is said to have been an able preacher and a good scholar. To have originated and successfully carried forward for a time, on a capital of six hundred dollars, the business of the infant Concern, he must have possessed good business talents. Not on his own motion did he engage in this work, but was designated to it, as "Book Steward," in connection with his regular ministerial work.* The first "Book Committee" was appointed in 1796. In 1804 the Concern was removed to New York. In 1836 it was consumed by fire, but was soon rebuilt. The branch house in Cincinnati was established in 1820. In 1836 the capital was $281,650. The present net capital is about $1,500,000. The aggregate of the several bound volumes published by the Book Agents is now over nineteen hundred.* Surely this is a great enterprise, requiring men of capacious minds to manage it. And yet, considering all the facts, all the inspirations, all the directions in the Book of Discipline, and the character of our ecclesiastical ancestry, it is only what a seer would have prophesied, and what we now see to be in harmony with the genius of Methodism—the soul and product of work. In prohibiting the "reading of those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God," one of the General Rules has all along impliedly urged the Church to profitable reading; and from the first, Mr. Wesley with his coadjutors was wise to provide suitable reading for his followers. The Book of Discipline urges on all the preachers a diligent employment of their time, "reading the most useful books." If for the lack of reading taste they fail to do so, they are urged to "contract a taste for it by use, or to return to their former employment."† And that the laity, also, shall be a reading people, it is made the duty of preachers "to take care that every society be duly supplied with books."‡ Sections 1 and 5, 6, covering nineteen pages of the Discipline, are devoted to advices and directions on the subject of education, on the printing and circulation of religious tracts, and on books and periodicals.

---

* Stevens's History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, vol. ii, p. 41, seq.

It being, therefore, well established that the inworking and directing spirit of Methodism is toward an intelligent ministry and a well educated and reading people, we see its harmony with the directions of the Great Teacher, who says to all his disciples, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me," and of the great Apostle who not only commended the mother and grandmother of Timothy for the good foundation which they laid in his youth for intelligent piety, but who urges Timothy to continue his study to show himself "approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth,"§ and, for the enriching of his mind, to was soon rebuilt. The branch house in Cincinnati was established in 1820. In 1836 the capital was $281,650. The present net capital is about $1,500,000. The aggregate of the several bound volumes published by the Book Agents is now over nineteen hundred.* Surely this is a great enterprise, requiring men of capacious minds to manage it. And yet, considering all the facts, all the inspirations, all the directions in the Book of Discipline, and the character of our ecclesiastical ancestry, it is only what a seer would have prophesied, and what we now see to be in harmony with the genius of Methodism—the soul and product of work. In prohibiting the "reading of those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God," one of the General Rules has all along impliedly urged the Church to profitable reading; and from the first, Mr. Wesley with his coadjutors was wise to provide suitable reading for his followers. The Book of Discipline urges on all the preachers a diligent employment of their time, "reading the most useful books." If for the lack of reading taste they fail to do so, they are urged to "contract a taste for it by use, or to return to their former employment."† And that the laity, also, shall be a reading people, it is made the duty of preachers "to take care that every society be duly supplied with books."‡ Sections 1 and 5, 6, covering nineteen pages of the Discipline, are devoted to advices and directions on the subject of education, on the printing and circulation of religious tracts, and on books and periodicals.

---

* Methodist Almanac for 1871. † Discipline, Part II., chap. ii, sec. 5, ans. 3.
‡ Disc., Part II., sec. 17, ans. 7. § 2 Tim. ii, 15.

It being, therefore, well established that the inworking and directing spirit of Methodism is toward an intelligent ministry and a well educated and reading people, we see its harmony with the directions of the Great Teacher, who says to all his disciples, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me," and of the great Apostle who not only commended the mother and grandmother of Timothy for the good foundation which they laid in his youth for intelligent piety, but also urges Timothy to continue his study to show himself "approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth,"§ and, for the enriching of his mind, to

---

* Methodist Almanac for 1879. † Discipline, Part II, chap. ii, sec. 2, ans. 3.
‡ Ibid., Part II, sec. 11, ans. 5. § 2 Tim. ii, 15.

"give attendance to reading;" * and then he requests him, when he should come to him in prison at Rome, to "bring the books, but especially the parchments." †

It is said that *study* makes an accurate and critical man, that *reading* makes a full and versatile man. And as "evil communications," come they from whatever source and by whatever means, "corrupt good manners," it is well, it is wise, that the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church have, from the beginning, taken special care to make her entire people both intelligent and pious. In this work ministers are expected, by advice and example, to take the lead. Indeed, it is made their *duty* "to preach on the subject of education once a year," and "to diffuse information by the distribution of tracts, or otherwise." ‡ An intelligent and educating ministry is in full harmony, if only anointed from above, with the life and power of godliness, and the highest degree of progress. And the best field and time for the formation and development of a sound mind, of a good character, and of correct tastes, are within the range of childhood and in families. As in reference to the knowledge of art, of science, and of history, so in reference to the knowledge of religious principles and Christian experience, youth is the time for productive work, as the family and the Church are the field. The reading of good and instructive books and magazines is a source of mental strength, the reading of bad or of worthless ones is about the same as is an association with evil persons. Indeed, the habitual reading of light, fictitious, and corrupt literature is worse than the ordinary associations of life, because it is more quietly, thoughtfully, and continuously done. The power of the printed page is often greater and more enduring, because more entrancing, than is conversation. The thread of thought is more continuous, and the plot and machinery of the story lead to a bewitching revery or to an absorption of thought and feeling. Much of the more popular literature of the times is written for the purpose of large sales and pecuniary profits. Beauty of style is made the covering of sin. An undue exaltation of humanity is made to depreciate the power of Christian truth, and the heroism of imagined characters is wrongly ennobled and falsely made to outrank and outshine Christian virtue.

---

* 1 Tim. iv, 13. † 2 Tim. iv, 13. ‡ Discipline, Part V, sec. i, ans. 3.

Not unfrequently the sanctities and obligations of marriage are lightly esteemed, Christian restraints are ridiculed, and the bonds of virtuous society are loosely held or are utterly disrupted. Under the adornments of rhetoric the poison of infidelity and sensuality is infused into the life-currents of thought and feeling, and thence into domestic and social circles. But the pleasure and advantage of choice reading are very great. It has been said that the disuse and loss of steam power in mechanics and travel, and the abolition of telegraphic communication, would throw civilization back a thousand years. But the destruction of printing and of books would be a much greater calamity, and would bring on a deeper barbarism.

No entertainment is at the same time so cheap and profitable as is instructive reading. For a few dollars, which are spent by many persons in "needless self-indulgence" or in dissipation, any young person may supply himself with the means of varied knowledge and with sources of intelligence, the pleasures of which far surpass those which are secured by a waste of time and money in sensual gratification. But in the selection of reading matter there should be a wise discrimination. One book of science, of travel, of biography, well written, lively, racy, suggestive, full of facts and of practical thoughts, pure and good, and carefully read, is more useful than a hundred insipid and exaggerated ones, hastily run over with no higher motive than to get an idea of their plots and of the issues of their unnatural tales. The eloquent Fénélon once said, "If the crowns of all the kingdoms of Europe were laid down at my feet in exchange for my love of reading, I would spurn them all." Choice and instructive reading is a grand means of improvement in all that constitute and promote symmetrical character and true civilization. And the burning of the famous library at Alexandria was, therefore, a greater loss to the world than would have been the destruction of the armies of Alexander. And the late destruction of the great library at Strasburg, by the bombardment of that city, is a greater calamity to the world of letters than is the fall of the city—which, by the way, is now transferred to a Protestant power—or than the marring of the cathedral, because of the burning of many rare manuscripts and volumes which

Not unfrequently, the sanctities and obligations of marriage are lightly esteemed, Christian festivals are ridiculed, and the bonds of virtuous society are loosely held or are utterly disrupted. Under the adornments of classic the poison of infidelity and sensuality is infused into the life-currents of thought and feeling, and thence into domestic and social circles. But the pleasure and advantage of choice reading are very great. It has been said that the disuse and loss of steam power in mechanics and travel, and the abolition of telegraphic communication, would throw civilization back a thousand years. But the destruction of printing and of books would be a much greater calamity, and would bring on a deeper barbarism.

No entertainment is at the same time so cheap and profitable as is instructive reading. For a few dollars, which are spent by many persons in "needless self-indulgence" or in dissipation, any young person may supply himself with the means of varied knowledge and with sources of intelligence, the pleasures of which far surpass those which are secured by a waste of time and money in sensual gratification. But in the selection of reading matter there should be a wise discrimination. One book of science, of travel, of biography, well written, lively, racy, suggestive, full of facts and of practical thoughts, pure and good, and carefully read, is more useful than a hundred insipid and exaggerated ones, hastily run over with no higher motive than to get an idea of their plots and of the scenes of their unnatural tales. The eloquent Fenelon once said, "If the crowns of all the kingdoms of Europe were laid down at my feet in exchange for my love of reading, I would spurn them all." Choice and instructive reading is a grand means of improvement in all that constitutes and promote symmetrical character and true civilization. And the burning of the famous library at Alexandria was, therefore, a greater loss to the world than would have been the destruction of the armies of Alexander. And the late destruction of the great library at Strasbourg, by the bombardment of that city, is a greater calamity to the world of letters than is the fall of the city—which, by the way, is now transferred to a Protestant power—or than the marring of the cathedral, because of the burning of many rare manuscripts and volumes which may not be replaced. The exhumings of Nineveh and Babylon, of Herculaneum and Pompeii, and the discovery of the Sinaitic Codex, by which the *Codex Vaticanus* is corrected or confirmed, reveal the amount of literary wealth time and catastrophe have buried.

The reading of good and useful books and periodicals, and the gathering of them into family, academic, and public libraries, promotes sound and wise intelligence. The reading of bad and noxious ones has a contrary tendency. Infidel productions, the vagaries of doubting neologists, the sickly sentimentalities of weak minds, the worse compound of American transcendentalism, are multiplied a thousand-fold and in every possible form, for the perversion of virgin thought and for the invalidation of solid Christian character. In order to supplant these kinds of literature, or, which is better, to prevent contact with them so far as one great Christian community is concerned, the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church have, from the beginning, attempted the encouragement and the publication of a great variety of books and periodicals in almost every range of thought, suited to families, to ministers, and to Churches. And they have done well, grandly well. No Church has done better.

ART. III.—THE APOCALYPSE A DRAMATIC ALLEGORY.

> The history of the world is a drama performed in the presence of invisible spectators.—UPHAM'S WISE MEN, p. 125.

Is there any key to a clear understanding and interpretation of this wonderful book? We think there is, and the title to this article is the key.

An allegory is a figurative description of real facts. Its purpose is to teach, to encourage, and caution. A spiritual or religious allegory is designed to convey a truth and illustrate a doctrine, more than to give a minute and historical detail of facts and the duration of events. This we take to be the drift of the book before us. Duties and doctrines are the sum and substance of its pages, and these are illustrated and applied, may not be replaced. The excavations of Nineveh and Babylon, of Herculaneum and Pompeii, and the discovery of the Sinaitic Codex, by which the *Codex Vaticanus* is corrected or confirmed, reveal the amount of literary wealth time and catastrophe have buried.

The reading of good and useful books and periodicals, and the gathering of them into family, academic, and public libraries, promotes sound and wise intelligence. The reading of bad and noxious ones has a contrary tendency. Infidel productions, the vagaries of doubting thoughts, the sickly sentimentalities of weak minds, the worse compound of Emerson's transcendentalism, are multiplied a thousand-fold and in every possible form, for the perversion of virgin thought, and for the invalidation of solid Christian character. In order to supplant these kinds of literature, or, which is better, to prevent contact with them so far as one great Christian community is concerned, the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church have, from the beginning, attempted the encouragement and the publication of a great variety of books and periodicals in almost every range of thought, suited to families, to ministers, and to Churches. And they have done well, greatly well. No Church has done better.

Art. III.—THE APOCALYPSE A DRAMATIC ALLEGORY.

The history of the world, is a drama performed in the presence of invisible spectators.—Trench's Five Ser., p. 18.

Is there any key to a clear understanding and interpretation of this wonderful book? We think there is, and the title to this article is the key.

An allegory is a figurative description of real facts. Its purpose is to teach, to encourage, and caution. A spiritual or religious allegory is designed to convey a truth and illustrate a doctrine, more than to give a minute and historical detail of facts and the duration of events. This we take to be the drift of the book before us. Duties and doctrines are the sum and substance of its pages, and these are illustrated and applied, enforced and impressed, with all the effect of a most brilliant and gorgeous panorama. And while we say this of the Apocalypse, we may also say the same of most of the prophetic and poetic books of the Bible. So of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, etc., and many of the sayings of our Lord.

It is not, therefore, properly speaking, either prophecy or revelation, and yet it partakes of the nature of both. It is *preaching*, illustrated and applied by metaphor instead of anecdote; or rather, it is religious truth dramatized. It is the Gospel of Christ, and the Church militant and the Church triumphant; each an act, with scenic representations drawn by a master-hand, most graphic, grand, and gorgeously glorious. It is divinely histrionic, elaborated by divine art, drawing from three worlds its acts, and actors, and audiences, and scenic surroundings.

Shakspeare dramatizes history and human character. Bunyan dramatizes Christian life and destiny, and John has inimitably dramatized Christian doctrines, duties, and destiny. Bunyan is allegorical, so also is Shakspeare. It is equally true of the Apocalypse. Shakspeare creates personages and pageants; so does Bunyan; so also does St. John the Divine. Shakspeare calls up from the unseen world his *dramatis personæ*. Bunyan does the same. St. John the Divine does the same in a bolder, loftier style, for his subject demands it, and his familiarity with the Prince and Ruler of all worlds gives it a naturalness and a dignity at once impressive and commanding, equal to a special and glorious revelation, which in reality it is designed to be and is.

We shall endeavor to arrange and analyze this dramatic allegory, so as to present the subject of it in its varied aspects in the simple and forcible light which its author designed.

I. The Church is Addressed. (Rev. i, 4, 9–11.)

II. The Model Church is Symbolized.

1. Christ, its glorious author, head, and purifier, living and reigning in it. (Rev. i, 5, 8, 12–16.)

2. The plenary indwelling of the all-quickening Holy Ghost: (Rev. i, 4, last clause:) "and from the seven spirits which are before the throne."

3. A luminous and living ministry within and over it: (Rev. i, 16:) the stars in the right hand of Christ.

4. A luminous and sanctified membership. (Rev. i, 12, 20.)

5. A (purified) rejoicing and happy Church and ministry. (Rev. i, 5, 6.)

III. THE ACTUAL CHURCH PORTRAYED. (Rev. ii and iii.)

1. The Church declining, (ii, 4,) yet commended, cautioned, counseled. The Church at Ephesus its representative symbol. (Rev. ii, 1–7.)

2. The steadfast Church. Commended, comforted, encouraged, inspirited. The Church of Smyrna its symbol and representative. (Rev. ii, 8–11.)

3. The Church perverted in fundamental doctrine, and, consequently, in practice. Its excellences acknowledged and its embarrassments admitted, but its danger and duty, and its sins, solemnly portrayed and urged. (Rev. ii, 12–17.) The Church at Pergamos its embodiment and symbol. Yet Christ is in it with the sharp sword of his word to reprove it, and also with hidden manna to feed it, and with the white stone engraved with his own divine name with which to seal it. (Rev. ii, 12–17.)

4. The Church zealous in works and doctrine, in suffering and sacrifice for Christ, and in extending the Gospel, and yet faulty in forming worldly alliances, and in its worldly conformity. Its zeal and earnestness have a promised reward and assured approbation, and yet Christ declares that a positive and decided discrimination shall be made between the false and the true among his people. The Church of Thyatira represents this phase of the Christian Church. (Rev. ii, 18–19.)

5. The Church formal and lifeless—a Church only in *name*. Its force is only numerical, and its vitality only apparent. Yet in this mass of formality and putrescence there are a *few* who are the very embodiment of moral purity. The trumpet of warning is sounded in the dead ears of the formal ones, and notes of joy in the ears of the faithful. The Church in Sardis is the type and representative, and the Roman Church, not to say any other, the realization, of this state of religion. (Rev. iii, 1–6.)

6. The Church reformed; zealous; holding the truth in the

3. A luminous and living ministry within and over it: (Rev. i, 16;) the stars in the right hand of Christ.

4. A luminous and sanctified membership. (Rev. i, 12, 20.)

5. A (glorified) rejoicing, and happy Church and ministry. (Rev. i, 5, 6.)

III. THE ACTUAL CHURCH PORTRAYED. (Rev. ii and iii.)

1. The Church declining, (ii, 4) yet commended, cautioned, counseled. The Church at Ephesus its representative symbol. (Rev. ii, 1-7.)

2. The steadfast Church. Commended, comforted, encouraged, inspirited. The Church of Smyrna its symbol and representative. (Rev. ii, 8-11.)

3. The Church perverted in fundamental doctrine, and, consequently, in practice. Its excellences acknowledged and its embarrassments admitted, but its danger and duty, and its sins, solemnly portrayed and urged. (Rev. ii, 12-17.) The Church at Pergamos its embodiment and symbol. For Christ is in it with the sharp sword of his word to reprove it, and also with hidden manna to feed it, and with the white stone engraved with his own divine name with which to seal it. (Rev. ii, 12-17.)

4. The Church zealous in works and doctrine, in suffering and sacrifice for Christ, and in extending the Gospel, and yet faulty in forming worldly alliances, and in its worldly conformity. Its zeal and earnestness have a promised reward and assured approbation, and yet Christ declares that a positive and decided discrimination shall be made between the false and the true among his people. The Church of Thyatira represents this phase of the Christian Church. (Rev. ii, 18-29.)

5. The Church formal and lifeless—a Church only in name. Its force is only numerical, and its vitality only apparent. Yet in this mass of formality and pretentiousness there are a few who are the very embodiment of moral purity. The trumpet of warning is sounded in the dead ears of the formal ones, and notes of joy in the ears of the faithful. The Church in Sardis is the type and representative, and the Roman Church, not to say any other, the realization, of this state of religion. (Rev. iii, 1-6.)

6. The Church reformed; zealous; holding the truth in the

love of it; persecuted; increasing in strength; missionating; diffusive; triumphant. (Rev. iii, 7–13.) The Church of Philadelphia is its type, the Church of the Reformation its realization.

7. The Church indifferent; latitudinarian; having neither martyr nor missionary zeal; neither evangelical principle nor earnest piety: and yet boastful of broad philanthropy and liberal principles, and cultured intellects and wealth of education. And, what is more, blind to the fundamental essence of religion, and the excellences of the forms of piety which it decrees. (Rev. iii, 14–22.) The Church of Laodicea is its representative, and the Church of Liberalism and Rationalism its embodiment and exponent.

In this varied portraiture of the Church we have also a most graphic and impressive idealization of the attributes and dignity of Christ. In the address to the Churches he is associated with the Father and the Holy Ghost, having equal authority and power in the Churches; and then he is set forth distinctly in his divine attributes of spirituality, immortality, and ineffable glory; at sight of whom even the favored disciple John fell as a dead man, powerless and prostrate.

In the address to the Church of Ephesus Christ stands as its great High Priest; in the midst of the Churches as their divine Lord; and their ministers, whether apostolic, episcopate, or diaconate, subservient to him—*in his hand*—subject to his bidding.

In the address to the Church of Pergamos he is speaking with the word of twofold power, or rather, of *all* power and authority—the sword with two edges striking all ways for the defense of his friends and the destruction of his foes. Before the Church of Thyatira he is set forth as the Omniscient and the All-powerful—his eyes as a flame of fire and his feet as fine brass—infinite in knowledge and in purity. To the Church in Sardis as the Inspiriter and Conservator of the Church. To the Church in Philadelphia, as the righteous and truth-keeping Sovereign, having all authority and government in his own hand, yea, all human destiny; and to the Laodicean Church as the Embodiment of all *truth*, and the Author of all things—not the first that was ever created, but the Creator himself. He it is who speaks with such emphasis and earnestness by the Holy Ghost through his servant John to the Churches of Asia and of all ages. Let them hear.

In the fourth chapter the allegorical or dramatic form of writing is fully assumed. The first three chapters may be considered prefatory and apologetic; the fourth enters upon the subject in *minutia*, with the most majestic and imposing imagery. The curtains of the sky are the drapery, and the heaven of God and his throne the scenic representations, and God and the Lamb, and the white-vested elders, and the cherubim, and angels, and saints, are the actors—the *dramatis personæ.*

The fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters may be considered

ACT I.

Subject—A series of scenes rapidly representing the interest God and angels take in the Church—its trials, persecutions, and triumphs; and the end of the world as the grand finale.

SCENE I. Chap. iv. *Theme.*—The ineffable glory of God and his heavenly dwelling-place; the sublime worship of heaven; and the majestic spiritual forces allied with the Church.

After this I looked, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said, Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the Spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. And he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty seats; and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices: and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven spirits of God. And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal: and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those beasts give glory and honor and thanks to him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory

In the fourth chapter the allegorical or dramatic form of writing is fully assumed. The first three chapters may be considered prefatory and apologetic; the fourth enters upon the subject in earnest, with the most majestic and inspiring imagery. The curtains of the sky are the drapery, and the heaven of God and his throne the scene represented there; and God and the Lamb, and the white-robed elders, and the cherubim, and angels, and saints, are the actors—the dramatis personæ.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters may be considered

ACT I.

Subject.—A series of scenes rapidly representing the interest God and angels take in the Church—its trials, persecutions, and triumphs; and the end of the world as the grand finale.

Scene I. Chap. iv. *Theme.*—The ineffable glory of God and his heavenly dwelling-place; the sublime worship of heaven; and the majestic spiritual forces allied with the Church.

After this I looked, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said, Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the Spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. And he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty seats: and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices: and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God. And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal: and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those beasts give glory and honor and thanks to him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.

SCENE II. Chap. v. *Theme*—The mystery of Divine government, especially in permitting the saints to suffer. Divine honors paid to Christ, as being the only one among all intelligences capable of unfolding this mystery. The prayers of God's people had in remembrance and assured of an answer—they are the incense of angels and cherubim before the throne of God.

And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the back side, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshiped him that liveth for ever and ever.

SCENE III. Chap. vi, 1, 2. *Theme*—One mystery allegorically represented: the all-conquering Gospel.

and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.

SCENE II. Chap. v. *Theme.*—The mystery of Divine government, especially in permitting the elect to suffer. Divine honors paid to Christ, as being the only one among all intelligences capable of unfolding this mystery. The prayers of God's people had in remembrance and assured of an answer—they are the incense of angels and elders before the throne of God.

And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.

SCENE III. Chap. vi. 1, 2. *Theme.*—One mystery allegorically represented: the all-conquering Gospel.

And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals, and I heard, as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, Come and see. And I saw, and behold a white horse: and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer.

SCENE IV. Chap. vi, 3, 4. *Theme*—The persecutions of the Church and its bloody trials.

And when he had opened the second seal, I heard the second beast say, Come and see. And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another: and there was given unto him a great sword.

SCENE V. Chap. vi, 5, 6. *Theme*—Great moral darkness—(the dark ages?)—vindictive justice meted out to the persecutors.

And when he had opened the third seal, I heard the third beast say, Come and see. And I beheld, and lo a black horse; and he that sat on him had a pair of balances in his hand. And I heard a voice in the midst of the four beasts say, A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny; and see thou hurt not the oil and the wine.

SCENE VI. Chap. vi, 7, 8. *Theme*—The final struggle between right and wrong—the wrong limited, though vastly destructive and desolating.

And when he had opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of the fourth beast say, Come and see. And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and hell followed with him. And power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth.

SCENE VII. Chap. vi, 9–11. *Theme*—The conscious state of the dead, and the glorious state of the martyred dead, and their abiding interest *in* and knowledge *of* the trials and triumphs of the Church militant.

And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.

Scene VIII. Chap. vi, 12–17. *Theme*—The end of the world and the terrible consternation and punishment of the wicked. The weakness of an innocent, helpless Lamb, stronger and more terrible than the strength of all the princes and great of the earth: mightier than war, than pestilence, than death and hell, than all the foes of saints can be, *for* he is upon the throne of all empire and power, wielding all elements of all worlds, and holding the eternal destiny of all men in his own hands.

And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind; and the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond man, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?

Chapter seventh may be considered in these scenes as

ACT II.

Dramatis Personæ.

Four angels holding the winds—The sealing angel—The multitude sealed. Closing with a grand transformation scene as the grand finale, in contrast with the finale of the first scene.

Scene I. Chap. vii, 1. *Theme*—Special providences conspiring for the preservation of the Church and the destruction of its enemies.

And after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree.

Scene II. Chap. vii, 2–12. *Theme*—God's special care to have all accept the Gospel by saving faith who will, both among the Jews and Gentiles, and that the final catastrophe

should not transpire until an innumerable multitude among all nations should accept the Gospel and be saved.

And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of God in their foreheads. And I heard the number of them which were sealed: and there were sealed a hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel. Of the tribe of Judah were sealed twelve thousand, etc.

SCENE III. Chap. vii, 13–17. *Theme*—The unspeakable glory of the glorified saints. A grand transformation scene: the perfect ultimate beatification of believers in Jesus represented.

And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.

Here again the scene changes, and another grand panorama passes before us in

ACT III.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

Seven angels with trumpets—An angel at the golden altar offering incense.

Scenic Representations: The smoke of incense—lightnings—thunder—earthquakes—hail—a burning mountain—a falling star—the sun and moon eclipsed—a shooting star—monster beasts, etc.

Subject Illustrated—Penal judgments on idolatrous nations, and especially on the nation of the Jews. (Chaps. viii and ix.)

SCENE I. Chap. viii, 1–4. *Theme*—The awe inspired, even among the good, at the contemplation of the judgments to be inflicted on the enemies of God, and the trials of his people, should not transpire until an innumerable multitude among all nations should accept the Gospel and be saved.)

And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of God in their foreheads. And I heard the number of them which were sealed: and there were sealed a hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel. Of the tribe of Judah were sealed twelve thousand, etc.

Scene III. Chap. vii, 13-17. *Theme*—The unspeakable glory of the glorified saints. A grand transformation scene: the perfect ultimate beatification of believers in Jesus represented.

And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.

Here again the scene changes, and another grand panorama passes before us in

ACT III.

Dramatis Personæ.

Seven angels with trumpets—An angel at the golden altar offering incense.

Scenic Representations: The smoke of incense—lightnings—thunder—earthquakes—hail—a burning mountain—a falling star—the sun and moon eclipsed—a shooting star—monster beasts, etc.

Subject Illustrated—Usual judgments on idolatrous nations, and especially on the nation of the Jews. (Chaps. viii and ix.)

Scene I. Chap. viii, 1-6. *Theme*—The awe inspired, even among the good, at the contemplation of the judgments to be inflicted on the enemies of God, and the trials of his people.

and the prayers of God's people that these judgments may, if possible, be averted, but if not, may be mitigated.

And when he had opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour. And I saw the seven angels which stood before God; and to them were given seven trumpets. And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand.

SCENE II. Chap. viii, 5–7. *Theme*—Judgments on the ungodly, though delayed, will surely come.

And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake. And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound. The first angel sounded, and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth: and the third part of trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.

SCENE III. Chap. viii, 8, 9. *Theme*—Sinners will be overtaken by the punishment of their sins wherever they may go or be, even though they flee away on ships upon the ocean.

And the second angel sounded, and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea: and the third part of the sea became blood: and the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had life, died; and the third part of the ships were destroyed.

SCENE IV. Chap. viii, 10, 11. *Theme*—The punishment of the ungodly will be bitterly severe and most intolerable, extending even to the cutting off of the necessaries of life.

And the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of waters; and the name of the star is called Wormwood: and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.

SCENE V. Chap. viii, 12, 13. *Theme*—Judgments unheeded will be followed by such as are more fearful; yet they are preceded and attended by divine expostulation with the wicked, and by warnings of their fearfulness.

And the fourth angel sounded, and the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part

of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise. And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabiters of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!

SCENE VI. Chap. ix, 1–11. *Theme*—When judgments are to come with unmitigated severity and fearfulness upon the ungodly, God is careful to forewarn his people in time to escape, and makes an evident distinction between them and the wicked, as in the destruction of Sodom and Jerusalem.

And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit. And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power. And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads. And to them it was given that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months: and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man. And in those days men shall seek death, and shall not find it; and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them. And the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads were as it were crowns like gold, and their faces were as the faces of men. And they had hair as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions. And they had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle. And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails: and their power was to hurt men five months. And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon.

SCENE VII. Chap. ix, 12–21. *Theme*—The wickedness of men is often so intense and inveterate that judgments cannot reform, but only punish and destroy them.

One woe is past; and, behold, there come two woes more hereafter. And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates. And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise. And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabiters of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!

SCENE VI. Chap. ix, 1-11. *Theme*—When judgments are to come with unmitigated severity and fearfulness upon the ungodly, God is careful to forewarn his people in time to escape, and makes an evident distinction between them and the wicked, as in the destruction of Sodom and Jerusalem.

And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit. And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power. And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads. And to them it was given that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months: and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man. And in those days men shall seek death, and shall not find it; and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them. And the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads were as it were crowns like gold, and their faces were as the faces of men. And they had hair as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions. And they had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle. And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails: and their power was to hurt men five months. And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon.

SCENE VII. Chap. ix, 12-21. *Theme*—The wickedness of men is often so intense and inveterate that judgments cannot reform, but only punish and destroy them.

One woe is past; and, behold, there come two woes more hereafter. And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates. And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men. And the number of the army of the horsemen were two hundred thousand thousand: and I heard the number of them. And thus I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sat on them, having breastplates of fire, and of jacinth, and brimstone: and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions; and out of their mouths issued fire and smoke and brimstone. By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths. For their power is in their mouth, and in their tails: for their tails were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt. And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk: neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts.

ACT IV.

Dramatis Personæ.

The Angel with the Book—John the Revelator.

Subject—Prophecy of the Old and New Covenant fulfilled. Scenic representation: Earth and Ocean, with the angel of Time standing on each; Jerusalem and the temple in the distance.

Scene I. Chap. x. *Theme*—Evidences of the nearness of the end of time, and the complete fulfillment of prophecy. There are great spiritual illuminations and great spiritual activity in the dissemination of the Gospel among the nations by God's people. The angel crowned with the rainbow and holding the book symbolizes the former, and John's eating the book and renewed commission to preach, the latter.

And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud: and a rainbow was upon his head, and his face was as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire: and he had in his hand a little book open: and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth, and cried with a loud voice, as when a lion roareth: and when he had cried, seven thunders uttered their voices. And when the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write: and I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not. And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer: but in the days of

the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets. And the voice which I heard from heaven spake unto me again, and said, Go and take the little book which is open in the hand of the angel which standeth upon the sea and upon the earth. And I went unto the angel, and said unto him, Give me the little book. And he said unto me, Take it, and eat it up; and it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey. And I took the little book out of the angel's hand, and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey: and as soon as I had eaten it, my belly was bitter. And he said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings.

SCENE II. Chap. xi, 1, 2. *Theme*—The abrogation of the old temple worship, and the destruction and continual desolation of Jerusalem.

And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months.

SCENE III. Chap. xi, 3–12. *Theme*—The harmony and vitality of Old and New Testament prophecies. They survive all efforts of false religionists and *no* religionists to suppress or supplant them, and their divinity shall ultimately rise resplendent to the eyes of all in their utter and complete fulfillment.

And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth. And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed. These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will. And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets. And the voice which I heard from heaven spake unto me again, and said, Go and take the little book which is open in the hand of the angel which standeth upon the sea and upon the earth. And I went unto the angel, and said unto him, Give me the little book. And he said unto me, Take it, and eat it up; and it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey. And I took the little book out of the angel's hand, and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey: and as soon as I had eaten it, my belly was bitter. And he said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings.

SCENE II. Chap. xi, 1, 2. *Theme*—The abrogation of the old temple worship, and the destruction and continued desolation of Jerusalem.

And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months.

SCENE III. Chap. xi, 3-12. *Theme*—The harmony and vitality of Old and New Testament prophecies. They survive all efforts of false adherents and [illegible] to suppress or supplant them, and their divinity shall ultimately rise resplendent to the eyes of all in their total and complete fulfillment.

And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth. And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed. These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will. And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth. And after three days and a half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud; and their enemies beheld them.

SCENE IV. Chap. xi, 13. *Theme*—The consequent upheaval and overthrow of antiquated and oppressive social, religious, and civil systems and customs and principles, and the rapid and wide-spread conversions to the Gospel of Christ.

And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven.

SCENE V. Chap. xi, 14–19. *Theme*—The ultimate triumph of the Gospel—the judgment. A second grand transformation scene: the dead raised, the saints glorified, and the upper temple seen.

The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail.

ACT V.

The *great*, all-comprehending Act, is given in the twelfth to the nineteenth chapters inclusive. The subject is the threefold forces arrayed against the Church—spiritual, seductive, and deceptive, and the forms they assume for its overthrow; the three often combined in their various forms of persecution, pleasure-send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth. And after three days and a half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud; and their enemies beheld them.

SCENE IV. Chap. xi, 13. *Theme*.—The consequent spheral and overthrow of antiquated and oppressive social, religious, and civil systems and customs and principles, and the rapid and wide-spread conversion to the Gospel of Christ.

And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven.

SCENE V. Chap. xi, 14-19. *Theme*.—The ultimate triumph of the Gospel—the judgment. A second grand transformation scene: the dead raised, the saints glorified, and the upper temple seen.

The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail.

ACT V.

The great, all-comprehending Act, is given in the twelfth to the nineteenth chapters inclusive. The subject is the threefold forces arrayed against the Church,—brutal, seductive, and deceptive, and the forms they assume for its overthrow;—the three often combined in their various forms of persecution, philosoproffering, and plausible sophistries. But against all these the Church contends with *ultimate* triumph assured, and encouragements for this by *frequent* and *signal* victories from time to time during the progress of the contest. During it all she is reminded often of the great secret of her invincible power—the atoning and purifying power of Jesus's blood, testified to as an experimental verity.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

The sun-clothed and star-crowned woman, the Church—The dragon, seven-headed and seven-crowned, and his angels—Michael and his angels—The leopard beast, seven-headed and ten-horned and ten-crowned—The two-horned beast—The Lamb of God and his company—The missionary angel—Two angels with sickles; a third commanding these—Seven angels with plagues—The gorgeously-appareled harlot, and a crowd of admirers—The King of saints and his innumerable army.

SCENE I. Chap. xii, 1, 2. *Theme*—The moral dignity and purity of the Church.

And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: and she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.

SCENE II. Chap. xii, 3, 4. *Theme*—The vileness and viciousness of the enemies of Christ and his Church.

And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.

SCENE III. Chap. xii, 5. *Theme*—The divine nature of Christ, as evidenced by his miraculous birth and preservation, and especially by his ascension to heaven.

And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.

SCENE IV. Chap. xii, 6, 14–17. *Theme*—The apparent weakness of the Church, and her divine protection.

proffering, and plausible sophistries. But against all these the Church contends with ultimate triumph assured, and encouragements for this by foregleams and signal victories from time to time during the progress of the contest. During it all she is reminded often of the great secret of her invincible power—the atoning and purifying power of Jesus's blood, testified to as an experimental verity.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

The sun-clothed and star-crowned woman, the Church—The dragon, seven-headed and seven-crowned, and his angels—Michael and his angels—The leopard beast, seven-headed and ten-horned and ten-crowned—The two-horned beast—The Lamb of God and his company—The missionary angel—Two angels with sickles; a third commanding these—Seven angels with plagues—The gorgeously appareled harlot, and a crowd of admirers—The King of saints and his innumerable army.

SCENE I. Chap. xii, 1, 2. *Theme*—The moral dignity and purity of the Church.

And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: and she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.

SCENE II. Chap. xii, 3, 4. *Theme*—The vileness and viciousness of the enemies of Christ and his Church.

And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.

SCENE III. Chap. xii, 5. *Theme*—The divine nature of Christ, as evidenced by his miraculous birth and preservation, and especially by his ascension to heaven.

And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.

SCENE IV. Chap. xii, 6, 14-17. *Theme*—The apparent weakness of the Church, and her divine protection.

And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days. And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent. And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood. And the earth helped the woman; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth. And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

SCENE V. Chap. xii, 7–13. *Theme*—The conflict begun, representing Satanic and angelic, as well as humanic, agencies in moral combat. The victory and triumph with the good, angelic and human.

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time. And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man child.

SCENE VI. Chap. xiii. *Theme*—The combination of civil power and false and perverted religion, all inspired by Satanic malice and agency to persecute Christianity.

And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to

And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days. And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent. And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood. And the earth helped the woman; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth. And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

Scene V. Chap. xii, 7-13. *Theme*—The conflict begun, representing Satanic and angelic, as well as terrestrial, agencies in moral combat. The victory and triumph with the good, angelic and human.

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time. And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man child.

Scene VI. Chap. xiii. *Theme*—The combination of civil power and false and perverted religion, all inspired by Satanic malice and agency to persecute Christianity.

And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshiped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshiped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain, from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints. And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred threescore and six.

SCENE VII. Chap. xiv, 1-5, 12, 13. *Theme*—The glorious state of the martyred dead. A grand transformation scene.

And I looked, and, lo, a lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him a hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps: and they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. These are they which were death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints. And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred threescore and six.

SCENE VII. (Chap. xiv, 1-5, 12, 13. *Theme*—The glorious state of the martyred dead. A grand transformation scene.

And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps: and they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God. . . . Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.

SCENE VIII. Chap. xiv, 6–11, 15–20. *Theme*—The universal spread of the Gospel, despite all persecution, and the warning of avenging wrath to come upon the finally impenitent, and the overthrow and end of all persecuting power, whether religious or civil, foretold.

And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. . . . And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped. And another angel came out of the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar, which had power over fire; and cried with a loud cry to him that had the sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe. And the angel thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast it into the great winepress of the wrath of God. And the winepress was trodden without the city, and blood came out of the winepress, even unto the horses' bridles, by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs.

SCENE IX. Chap. xv, 2–4. *Theme*—The rejoicing of the saints over the prospective fulfillment of prophecy, and vindication of the Divine administration, so soon and clearly to be manifest.

And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.

SCENE X. Chap. xv, 1, 5–8; xvi, 1–21. *Theme*—Divine judgments inflicted on the enemies of Christ and his people for their punishment, and for thwarting their malicious purposes, and for the final and glorious universal triumph of the Gospel. These final judgments and victories have their type in the plagues sent upon Egypt and Pharaoh.

And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God. . . . And after that I looked, and, behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened: and the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen, and having their breasts girded with golden girdles. And one of the four beasts gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God, who liveth for ever and ever. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled. . . . And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth. And the first went, and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image. And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea. And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood. And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus. For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments.

SCENE IX. Chap. xv, 2-4. *Theme.*—The rejoicing of the saints over the prospective fulfillment of prophecy, and vindication of the Divine administration, so soon and clearly to be manifest.

And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.

SCENE X. Chap. xv, 1, 5-8; xvi, 1-21. *Theme.*—Divine judgments inflicted on the enemies of Christ and his people for their punishment, and for thwarting their malicious purposes, and for the final and glorious universal triumph of the Gospel. These final judgments and victories have their type in the plagues sent upon Egypt and Pharaoh.

And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God. . . . And after that I looked, and, behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened: and the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen, and having their breasts girded with golden girdles. And one of the four beasts gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God, who liveth for ever and ever. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled. . . . And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth. And the first went, and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image. And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea. And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood. And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus. For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments.

> And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give him glory. And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds. And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared. And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.

Verse fifteen interjects a Divine warning of the speediness of these impending judgments.

> Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath. And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great.

SCENE XI. Chaps. xvii, xviii. *Theme*—The iniquity and end of the Roman power, both heathen and papal, described and predicted under the image of a harlot who

> Was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.

That this, with the whole picture of menace and destruction filling the chapter, refers to *Rome*, the inspired writer himself

assures us in chapter xvii, 18, which see. It is as direct and plain as his explanation of the stars and the candlesticks in chapter i, 20, which see.

SCENE XII. Chap. xix. *Theme*—The joy of God's people over the fulfillment of prophecy, in the final overthrow of all persecuting power, and the prospect of an immediate conversion of the world, Christ himself leading on his Church to universal conquest.

And I saw heaven opened, and, behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

ACT VI.

This concludes the drama. *Subject*—The resurrection, first and second; the judgment; and the final glorious state of the saints. (Chaps. xx, xxi, xxii, 1–5.)

SCENE I. Chap. xx, 1–3. *Theme*—The termination of Satanic reign and influence of every form and character.

[illegible] as in chapter xvii, 18, which see. It is as direct and plain as his explanation of the stars and the candlesticks in chapter i, 20, which see.

SCENE XII. Chap. xix. *Theme*—The joy of God's people over the fulfillment of prophecy, in the final overthrow of all persecuting power, and the prospect of an immediate conversion of the world, Christ himself leading on his Church to universal conquest.

And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

ACT VI.

This concludes the drama. *Subject*—The resurrection, first and second; the judgment; and the final glorious state of the saints. (Chaps. xx, xxi, xxii, 1-5.)

SCENE I. Chap. xx, 1-3. *Theme*—The termination of Satanic reign and influence of every form and character.

And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.

SCENE II. Chap. xx, 4–6. *Theme*—The resurrection and temporal reign of the saints.

And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

SCENE III. Chap. xx, 7–10. *Theme*—The final and ineffectual effort of Satan to resume his reign on earth by massing all possible forces against the people of God, and his complete discomfiture and eternal punishment in the torments of hell.

And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

SCENE IV. Chap. xx, 11–15. *Theme*—The second resurrection and the judgment, and the doom of eternal punishment on the finally wicked with Satan in hell.

And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it;

and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

SCENE V. Chap. xxi, 1–5. *Theme*—The final glorification of the saints represented in a rapid succession of the most vividly glowing transformation scenes.

1. A new heaven and a new earth, in which righteousness is found, verse 1: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea."

2. A new and gorgeous city in which God and the saints are to dwell for ever. The grandeur and glory of this city are so magnificent that the revelator exhausts all the wealth of Oriental conception and imagery on its minute description. (Chap. xxi, 2–26; xxii, 1–5.)

> And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, etc.

THE EPILOGUE.—In which is set forth the import and purpose of the book, and its sacred and inspired character, and the fearful consequences of rejecting or misrepresenting its teachings, with a final warning of the certainty and suddenness of Christ's visitation in judgment of his enemies and reward of his friends, closing with the Christian benediction. (Verses 6–21.)

It is not assumed that the above is an exhaustive treatment of the subject. This were impossible in so brief a form, and with so many suggestive aspects of the subject as the inspired Revelator presents it in. The writer hopes hereafter to present it in an enlarged and more complete form; and if an artist can be found who can enter into the spirit of these themes, to have the work elaborately illustrated.

and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

SCENE V. (Chap. xxi, 1-8. *Theme*—The final glorification of the saints represented in a rapid succession of the most vividly glowing transformation scenes.

1. A new heaven and a new earth, in which righteousness is found, verse 1: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea."

2. A new and gorgeous city in which God and the saints are to dwell for ever. The grandeur and glory of this city are so magnificent that the revelator exhausts all the wealth of Oriental conception and imagery on its minute description. (Chap. xxi, 9-26; xxii, 1-5.)

And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, etc.

THE EPILOGUE.—In which is set forth the import and purpose of the book, and its sacred and inspired character, and the fearful consequences of rejecting or misrepresenting its teachings, with a final warning of the certainty and suddenness of Christ's visitation in judgment of his enemies and reward of his friends, closing with the Christian benediction. (Verses 6-21.)

It is not assumed that the above is an exhaustive treatment of the subject. This were impossible in so brief a form, and with so many suggestive aspects of the subject as the inspired Revelator presents it in. The writer hopes hereafter to present it in an enlarged and more complete form; and if an artist can be found who can enter into the spirit of these themes, to have the work elaborately illustrated.

Art. IV.—GERMAN EXPLORATIONS IN AFRICA.

For the last twenty years the Germans have been exploring Africa in every direction, but in a manner so quiet and unobtrusive that the world has not been aware of their labors. Most of these travelers have undertaken their difficult and dangerous journeys with but little or no support from the governments or scientific associations, and frequently with means and retinues so meager that we are astonished at the boldness of their enterprises, and the almost reckless courage that seems to have inspired them in their thirst after knowledge; and knowledge appears to have been the great incentive of their labors in nearly all circumstances, until quite recently, in the case of Rohlfs, who, to the accuracy of the scientific explorer adds the keen eye of the commercial investigator, and is already suggesting to Germany the feasibility of making a German India of Northern Africa, and from this base opening commercial relations that shall find their passage across the deserts to the rich plains of Central Africa, and from these to the ports on the western and south-western coasts.

For years the German *savants* have been listening with intense interest to the stories of Barth and Vogel, Overweg and Beurmann in Central Africa, and to Heuglin and Steudner along the Upper Nile and in Abyssinia. Most of these men have been veritable heroes, and have sacrificed their lives to the cause of science; and some of them have been so fortunate as to establish friendly relations between various African chieftains and their own governments. This is especially the case with the Sultan of Bornou, who has ever received these German explorers in so kindly a spirit that the King of Prussia recently sent a deputation to his Majesty with costly presents as a testimonial of his esteem for the sable monarch.

In the practical relations that have thus of late grown up between Germany and Africa the leading spirit is Rohlfs, who has spent the last ten years in acquiring an intimate acquaintance with Central Africa and the western and northern coasts. He is inspired with the idea that Germany has a great and peaceful mission to perform in that comparatively unknown and unappreciated country, and for the past year he has been

lecturing before learned associations and popular gatherings to that effect. He is largely aided in this labor by the letters of Maltzan, a fellow-countryman, who has long lived and traveled in the provinces along the northern coast and in Lower Egypt. These two are the live men of the hour, and have given to the world a mass of most interesting and useful information concerning Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, and Egypt.

In case of European colonization, this northern belt, along the Mediterranean coast, will of course receive the first settlers, and is therefore first in importance to the present hour. For many years the French have been making efforts to settle Algeria, with indifferent success, and these German explorers attribute the failure in great measure to a very unfortunate system of government, which much resembles that of a penal colony. With the aspirations of the new German empire there is a strong desire to meet France even on the shores of Africa; and it is quite clear that hereafter French influence is to find along this coast, and in Egypt and Turkey, no mean rival.

Rohlfs' accounts of his experience in Morocco sound more like romance than history. Several times he was attacked by robbers and left for dead; and once, covered with nine wounds, he lay for two days and three nights in the desert: there he found good Samaritans in the inhabitants of a neighboring oasis, who kindly cared for him, and enabled him to resume his travels. He had scarcely entered on his first journey in this inhospitable country when he was robbed of every thing that he possessed; but, declining to turn back, he had the courage to press on to the first grand cheriff and apply for the position of surgeon in the army. This he obtained, and was soon promoted to the post of body-physician to the Governor, and thus obtained access to the royal city of Fez, the residence of the Emperor. Shortly after this the Governor was poisoned, evidently by superior orders, and Rohlfs was suspected of being accessory to the deed. His life, however, was spared through the dying words of the Governor himself, who in the warmest terms recommended the physician to his son and heir. He was then soon promoted to be private physician to the Emperor himself; but he found his position one of so much delicacy and suspicion that he declined giving internal remedies, lest any unfortunate result of lecturing before learned associations and popular gatherings to that effect. He is largely aided in this labor by the letters of Maltzan, a fellow-countryman, who has long lived and traveled in the provinces along the northern coast and in Lower Egypt. These two are the live men of the hour, and have given to the world a mass of most interesting and useful information concerning Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, and Egypt.

In case of European colonization, this northern belt along the Mediterranean coast, will of course receive the first settlers, and is therefore first in importance to the present desire. For many years the French have been making efforts to settle Algeria, with indifferent success, and these German explorers attribute the failure in great measure to a very unfortunate system of government, which much resembles that of a penal colony. With the aspirations of the new German empire there is a strong desire to meet France even on the shores of Africa; and it is quite clear that hereafter French influence is to find along this coast, and in Egypt and Turkey, no mean rival.

Rohlfs' accounts of his experiences in Morocco sound more like romance than history. Several times he was attacked by robbers and left for dead; and once, covered with ghastly wounds, he lay for two days and three nights in the desert. Here he found good Samaritans in the inhabitants of a neighboring oasis, who kindly cared for him, and enabled him to resume his travels. He had scarcely entered on his first journey in this inhospitable country when he was robbed of everything that he possessed; but, declining to turn back, he had the courage to press on to the first grand chérif and apply for the position of surgeon in the army. This he obtained, and was soon promoted to the post of body physician to the Governor, and thus obtained access to the royal city of Fez, the residence of the Emperor. Shortly after this the Governor was poisoned, evidently by superior orders, and Rohlfs was suspected of being accessory to the deed. His life, however, was spared through the dying words of the Governor himself, who in the warmest terms commended the physician to his son and heir. He was then soon promoted to be private physician to the Emperor himself; but he found his position one of so much delicacy and suspicion that he declined giving internal remedies, lest any unfortunate result of his treatment might receive an unjust and dangerous interpretation. He depended entirely on strong external applications and written amulets, which rewarded him with so much success that he found it difficult to get rid of his charge with a view of pursuing his travels.

The intervention of the English Consul procured him a release, with the permission to travel throughout the empire with imperial protection, which he did with so much the more success on account of his experience, and the acquisition of the Arabic tongue during his stay. He was now prepared to be as good a Moslem as any of them, and adopted this disguise to insure his safety and success. The tribes of Morocco seem to have made but little progress during the last two thousand years. They are fearfully rude and degraded. They seldom wash themselves more than once a year, and rarely lay aside their clothes until these fall from their backs in rags. They eat with their fingers out of a common dish, and think it an attention to a stranger to fish out the choice pieces and stuff them into his mouth. One fifth of the population consists of Arabian invaders, and the remainder are native Berbers. But very few of them understand the Koran, the prayers, or the religious precepts, which are all in the Arabic tongue, even in Turkey; yet, nevertheless, they are the most bigoted Moslems, and threatened several times to murder Rohlfs, whom they suspected of being a "Christian dog." But his life was always saved by the intervention of the Governor's son, who was a distant descendant of the Prophet; and, as these persons always become more sacred with every generation, their influence is all-powerful. He finally gave Rohlfs a document in which he acknowledged distant relationship with the traveler, and thus the possibility of his having a particle of sacred blood in his veins saved him from violence on several occasions, and proved a safe conduct through manifold dangers.

Having become pretty well acquainted with the main points of interest regarding the cities, plains, and rivers of Morocco, he crossed the Atlas chain with great difficulty and thus made his way to Algeria. Here he took occasion to read the French Emperor a lesson which it is to be hoped his successors in government may profit by. The native tribes of Algeria are ruled by a set of bureaucrats, who introduce all the

rigor of military law into civil affairs, and have no sympathy with those who are placed under them. These rulers go to Algeria as the English go to India, not to identify themselves with the country, but to see how much they can profit by it, and the result is, that they are cordially hated by all parties. Even the French settlers there complain greatly of them. Algeria needs to be colonized by a race that propose to stay there and make it their home, and desire to leave a profitable inheritance to their children. But the French seem to be little calculated for such emigration, and less inclined to it, and Algeria is therefore rather a satrapy than a French colony. Rohlfs takes the position that the Arabs can never be civilized, and thinks that they ought to be driven to the desert whence they came, as they are the most intolerant of men in religion, and the most unwilling to be bound by the rules of civilized life. With the Arabs away, and a general commingling of French immigrants among the Kabyles, or native tribes, in the form of settlements, there would be some possibility of making in the land an acceptable home for industrious agricultural races.

Maltzan has made a more thorough study of Algeria than Rohlfs, and has given us some very timely information regarding the native troops that the French brought over to Europe to help them fight their battles against the Germans. These Turcos seem to possess the worst qualities of the wild Arab and the native negro. They have not the remotest idea of honesty, and the colonists stand in mortal fear of them on the occasion of any outbreak. During peace the rigor of military discipline keeps them within some bounds; but the moment the war trumpet sounds they are as wild and relentless as savages. Their religious fanaticism makes them turn against all that are not followers of the Prophet; but they seem to have a special hatred of the Jews, of whom there are great numbers in nearly every city in Algeria. The Jews have profited largely by the regular government of the French, and in the security thus afforded them have grown to be the richest of the land. In periods of peace these Turcos, or Kabyles, as they are called out of military service, are frequently servants to the wealthy Jews, on account of the profitable rewards that these people are able to bestow. But still rigor of military law into civil affairs, and have no sympathy with those who are placed under them. These rulers go to Algeria as the Englishmen go to India, not to identify themselves with the country, but to see how much they can profit by it, and the result is, that they are cordially hated by all parties. Even the French settlers there complain greatly of them. Algeria needs to be colonized by a race that purpose to stay there and make it their home, and desire to leave a profitable inheritance to their children. But the French seem to be little calculated for such emigration, and less inclined to it, and Algeria is therefore rather a satrapy than a French colony. Rohlfs takes the position that the Arabs can never be civilized, and thinks that they ought to be driven to the desert whence they came, as they are the most intolerant of men in religion, and the most unwilling to be bound by the rules of civilized life. With the Arabs away, and a general commingling of French immigrants among the Kabyles, or native tribes, in the form of settlements, there would be some possibility of making of the land an acceptable home for industrious agricultural races.

Maltzan has made a more thorough study of Algeria than Rohlfs, and has given us some very timely information regarding the native troops that the French brought over to Europe to help them fight their battles against the Germans. These Turcos seem to possess the worst qualities of the wild Arab and the native negro. They have not the remotest idea of decency, and the colonists stand in mortal fear of them on the occasion of any outbreak. During peace the rigor of military discipline keeps them within some bounds; but the moment the war trumpet sounds they are as wild and relentless as savages. Their religious fanaticism makes them turn against all that are not followers of the Prophet; but they seem to have a special hatred of the Jews, of whom there are great numbers in nearly every city in Algeria. The Jews have profited largely by the regular government of the French, and in the security thus afforded them have grown to be the richest of the land. In periods of peace these Turcos, or Kabyles, as they are called out of military service, are frequently servants to the wealthy Jews, on account of the profitable rewards that these people are able to bestow. But still the Moslem Kabyle serves the infidel Jew most unwillingly, and envies him the position of master; and when in periods of agitation he enters the ranks of the Turcos he finds his opportunity to wreak his vengeance on his former employer for his wounded pride and humiliation. The Jew must now pay for being wealthier and more elevated in the social scale than the Moslem. He is rich, he has money in his coffers, and his wife and daughters have costly ornaments, and these are great attractions to the greedy, booty-loving Turco. Persecutions and plunderings of the Jews are, therefore, sure to accompany the commencement of any war, first in the garrison cities, and then in the villages all over the country. In the city of Algiers especially, where these murderous hordes collect for embarkation, the Jews are beaten and slaughtered, or robbed and their homes burned. Sometimes the authorities are powerless to control them; and at times it seems as if they think it will whet the savagery of the Turcos to give them an opportunity to taste of blood and plunder before starting. It is of course well understood that it is only native Jews that are thus treated. If French Jews are touched, means are soon found to quell the outrage and violence. Such scenes were enacted on the eve of the Italian and Mexican campaigns, and were repeated as these brutal hordes were collecting to proceed on the German raid that landed them securely in the military prisons of the Fatherland.

And these savages are just as ready to turn against the power they serve if they have any thing in the line of plunder to gain by it, or have the least hope of success. The French troops had scarcely been withdrawn from Algeria before the native troops left behind began a revolt, accompanied with rapine and robbery. The military art which the French had taught them they put into operation against their masters; and we all know of the chronic revolt in Kabylia that continued as long as the French were weak and unable to protect themselves. The opinion of thoughtful men, therefore, seems to be, that the whole system of colonization and government in Algeria is rotten to the core, and must be radically altered before France can hope to have a colony from which she can derive the least benefit.

the Moslem Kabyle serves the infidel far more punctiliously, and envies him the position of master; and when in periods of agitation he enters the ranks of the Turcos he finds the opportunity to wreak his vengeance on his former employer for his wounded pride and humiliation. The Jew must now pay for being wealthier and more elevated in the social scale than the Moslem. He is rich, he has money in his coffers, and his wife and daughters have costly ornaments, and these are great attractions to the greedy, booty-loving Turcos. Persecutions and plunderings of the Jews are therefore sure to accompany the commencement of any war, first in the garrison cities, and then in the villages all over the country. In the city of Algiers especially, where these murderous bodies collect for embarkation, the Jews are beaten and slaughtered, or robbed and their homes burned. Sometimes the authorities are powerless to control them; and at times it seems as if they think it will whet the savagery of the Turcos to give them an opportunity to taste of blood and plunder before starting. It is of course well understood that it is only native Jews that are thus treated. If French Jews are touched, means are soon found to quell the outrage and violence. Such scenes were enacted on the eve of the Italian and Mexican campaigns, and were repeated as these brutal hordes were collecting to proceed on the German raid that landed them securely in the military prisons of the Fatherland.

And these savages are just as ready to turn against the power they serve if they have any thing in the line of plunder to gain by it, or have the least hope of success. The French troops had scarcely been withdrawn from Algeria before the native troops left behind began a revolt, accompanied with rapine and robbery. The military art which the French had taught them they put into operation against their masters; and we all know of the chronic revolt in Kabylia that continued as long as the French were weak and unable to protect themselves. The opinion of thoughtful men, therefore, seems to be, that the whole system of colonization and government in Algeria is rotten to the core, and must be radically altered before France can hope to have a colony from which she can derive the least benefit.

Baron von Maltzan has spent several years in studying every phase of life in the coast-lands of Northern Africa, and has become most thoroughly acquainted with them even into Arabia, and is a better authority regarding Algeria than Rhlofs. He has gained much of his information in the most adventurous disguise, among a population fanatically hostile toward Christian blood in any shape. Within the last twelve years he has wandered from Mogador through Morocco to Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli, and so along the coast to Egypt and into Arabia as far as Mecca, making a most careful pilgrimage, during which he has combined scientific research with the love of adventure. His success in assuming the Moslem garb and tongue has been so great that he has entered into the most inaccessible social circles of the Arabs, and unvailed to us a phase of life seldom observed by any but genuine followers of the Prophet.

Thoroughly acquainted with both Algeria and Tunis, he draws an interesting comparison between the two countries, which forty years ago were just alike. Algeria has become partly French, while Tunis has remained wholly Arab. The city of Algiers has assumed the appearance of Marseilles, while the original populace remain there as firmly imbedded in the ways of the Moslems as ever. Moors and Arabs bow their necks to the superior French sword, but French ideas gain no access to their heads. Tunis still shows the irregular, labyrinthine style of Oriental architecture, and few Europeans are seen except the scum of Southern Europe, who escape there to avoid the consequences of crime, and who are such a pest to European consuls that these defend the entrance to their houses against them by armed janissaries. The Court is endeavoring to assume the European style in military costume, but they are so awkward in the effort as to excite little else than ridicule. In both cities the power of Islam seems to have held its own, only in Algiers it smothers under the ashes, while in Tunis it shoots forth into bright flames at every opportunity. In Algiers, French bayonets protect the Frank in entering the mosques ; in Tunis, the stranger exposes himself to a stoning if he even dare to cross the threshold.

French reports boast of the success of the government schools established for the Arabs in Algiers. This, Maltzan

Baron von Maltzan has spent several years in studying every phase of life in the coast lands of Northern Africa, and has become most thoroughly acquainted with them even into Arabia, and is a better authority regarding Algeria than Rohlfs. He has gained much of his information in the most adventurous disguise, among a population remarkably hostile toward Christian blood in any shape. Within the last twelve years he has wandered from Mogador through Morocco to Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli, and so along the coast to Egypt and into Arabia as far as Mecca, making a most careful pilgrimage, during which he has combined scientific research with the love of adventure. His success in assuming the Moslem garb and tongue has been so great that he has entered into the most inaccessible social circles of the Arabs, and unveiled to us a phase of life seldom observed by any but genuine followers of the Prophet.

Thoroughly acquainted with both Algeria and Tunis, he draws an interesting comparison between the two countries, which forty years ago were just alike. Algeria has become partly French, while Tunis has remained wholly Arab. The city of Algiers has assumed the appearance of Marseilles, while the original populace remain there as firmly inbedded in the ways of the Moslems as ever. Moors and Arabs bow their necks to the superior French sword, but French ideas gain no access to their heads. Tunis still shows the irregular, labyrinthian style of Oriental architecture, and few Europeans are seen except the scum of Southern Europe, who escape there to avoid the consequences of crime, and who are such a pest to European consuls that these defend the entrance to their houses against them by armed janissaries. The Court is endeavoring to assume the European style in military costume, but they are so awkward in the effort as to excite little else than ridicule. In both cities the power of Islam seems to have held its own, only in Algiers it smoulders under the ashes, while in Tunis it shoots forth into bright flames at every opportunity. In Algiers, French bayonets protect the Franks in entering the mosques; in Tunis the stranger exposes himself to a stoning if he even dare to cross the threshold.

French reports boast of the success of the government schools established for the Arabs in Algiers. This, Maltzan denies, affirming that only those Arabs send their children to the schools who are in the service of the Government, and when their children leave the schools the parents do their best to make them forget what they have learned. No respectable Arab sends his children to such schools, and much less his girls to the Franco-Arabic girls' school established by the authorities. Those who are educated in the latter are regarded as the scum of humanity by the true Arabs. The sorry teaching of the Koran is all that the great mass enjoy, notwithstanding the efforts of the French for forty years. It is only in the Jewish institutions of learning that French culture has a visible influence. Algeria is the better governed of the two, on account of the protection afforded to property by the French officers, while Tunis still suffers under an arbitrary military despot. And this difference of administration has produced a marked difference in the moral status of the people. Polygamy is almost unknown in Algeria, while it is very common in Tunis.

Experience proves that the race in Northern Africa deteriorates as we proceed from west to east. Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, and Egypt seem to form a sliding scale, with degraded Egypt at the base. Energy, strength, and the sense of patriotism seem to decrease; but the people become more docile and ready to accept efforts at civilization. Tunis lies further to the east, and follows this law. During the last thirty years no less than three sovereigns have occupied the throne, each one of whom has been the representative of a different system, with new virtues and vices. They all try in some measure to adopt something from European civilization, but are sure to halt between two opinions, and do neither one thing nor the other. The last ruler was quite inclined to introduce some reforms, and affected a constitution; but his fanatical people, who are blindly attached to the ways of Islamism, annoyed him so much on account of this innovation that he is said to have been actually tormented to death.

The present ruler, brother of the former one, is no better. He calls himself "the Just," but his justice is of a negative character, for he does neither good nor bad. He has transferred his government to a Greek renegade, who rules the country in his own interest, while the sovereign amuses him-

self in the most childish way with jesters and court-fools. His usual associates are young men whom he has picked up here and there and dubbed with high-sounding military titles. He has a lieutenant-general of twenty-one years of age, two major-generals of nineteen, a dozen colonels of about sixteen, and captains, etc., whose age does not exceed eleven or twelve. The son of the prime minister, however, though quite a young man, has made a very rare collection of antiquities from the Phœnician and Carthaginian ruins in the vicinity, and possesses a museum that of its kind has no rival in the world. But this treasure is watched with argus eyes, and no stranger is allowed to have a glance at it. The boy who collected it seems to have no adequate conception of its value, but in an undefined suspicion of its rarity he guards it with a fanatical zeal, and especially against European eyes. Maltzan only gained access to the sanctuary after the most determined persistence and the boldest efforts. He was then surprised to find it exceeded all his expectations in its wealth of Phœnician inscriptions—there being several hundred wholly unknown to European museums, and about as many as are found in all of the European collections taken together. But he was treated quite rudely, and absolutely refused the privilege of copying them. A casual inspection was all that was accorded to him, and he left with the determination of seeing them under more favorable circumstances at some other period. This was in 1868.

The following year he made another visit with the express intention of knowing more of this rare collection and obtaining exact copies of the inscriptions. He was not permitted to copy them even this time, although he had been promised the privilege, of doing so, for, when he undertook to transfer the Phœnician inscriptions to paper, the Tunisians with great rudeness interfered with him as if he were a defiler of their sanctuary. He was obliged to abandon the effort again, and deceived and discouraged he again left Tunis. But in the fall of the same year he presented himself a third time to the son of the premier in a condition to resent any ignominious treatment. A very emphatic recommendation and introduction on the part of the Prussian Government changed the barbarously rude possessor of the museum into quite an obliging man, and Maltzan received the permission to make copies.

self in the most childish way with jewels and ornaments. The usual associates are young men whom he has picked up here and there and dubbed with high-sounding military titles. He has a Lieutenant-general of twenty-one years of age, two major-generals of nineteen, a dozen colonels of about sixteen, and captains, etc. whose age does not exceed eleven or twelve. The son of the prime minister, however, though quite a young man, has made a very rare collection of antiquities from the Phœnician and Carthaginian ruins in the vicinity, and possesses a museum that of its kind has no rival in the world. But this treasure is watched with argus eyes, and no stranger is allowed to have a glance at it. The boy who collected it seems to have no adequate conception of its value, but in an unfeeling suspicion of its rarity he guards it with a misplaced zeal, and especially against European eyes. Maltzan only gained access to the sanctuary after the most determined persistence and the boldest efforts. He was then surprised to find it exceeded all his expectations in its wealth of Phœnician inscriptions—there being several hundred wholly unknown to European museums, and about as many as are found in all of the European collections taken together. But he was treated quite rudely, and absolutely refused the privilege of copying them. A casual inspection was all that was accorded to him, and he left with the determination of seeing them under more favorable circumstances at some other period. This was in 1868.

The following year he made another visit with the express intention of knowing more of this rare collection, and obtaining exact copies of the inscriptions. He was not permitted to copy them even this time, although he had been promised the privilege of doing so, for, when he undertook to transfer the Phœnician inscriptions to paper, the Tunisians with great rudeness interfered with him and by every device of their strategy. He was obliged to abandon the effort again, and disgusted and discouraged he again left Tunis. But in the fall of the same year he presented himself a third time to the son of the premier in a condition to resist any humiliating treatment. A very emphatic recommendation and introduction on the part of the Prussian Government changed the barbarously rude presence of the minister into quite an obliging mien, and Maltzan received the permission to make copies.

He had a strong desire to take photographs of the inscriptions in order to prevent all doubt as to his scientific accuracy, but in this he met with a refusal, as the owner declared that he could have them photographed himself, and thereby become a celebrated man. Determined not to be thus baffled, Maltzan made another effort, backed by the influence of the English Governor of Malta, and this time he succeeded. Overjoyed at his success, he sent immediately to Malta for a photographer and apparatus, but on their arrival the young man changed his mind, and withdrew the permission with the declaration that it was his intention to publish a set of photographic inscriptions on his own account. So Maltzan was obliged to be contented with bringing away copies, of which he obtained about sixty. Among these are the most important eulogistic inscriptions found in the museum of the castle of Manuba, and the only tomb inscription found in modern times, also from the same place. To these may be added some very valuable ones from an ancient museum of Carthage, and also a few from the maritime port of Goletta.

It appears that the fortunate possessor of these relics sent some of them to Paris to the great Exhibition of 1867, with the assurance that he had a great many more. From the character of these it was suspected that he knew nothing about their intrinsic value, and had only chosen those that struck his fancy as being the most presentable for the Exposition, therefore the ardent desire of Maltzan to get a sight of these antiquities that had never been subjected to the investigation of any one skilled in ancient inscriptions. Most of those sent were in reality figures in the coarsest style of art, awkward and childish, and containing but few inscriptions. It was quite evident that they were sent because they pleased the rude fancy of their possessor, and it turned out that he has about one hundred and fifty in all, some of them of rare value to the archæologist.

The discovery of these induced Maltzan to make a tour through the provinces of Tunis, which he did under the protection of the Bey, on account of his letters from the Court of Prussia. This portion of Africa possesses a very large amount of monumental souvenirs of the great periods of its past. The monuments of the remotest period—that of the Phœnicians

He had a strong desire to take photographs of the inscriptions in order to prevent all doubt as to his scientific accuracy, but in this he met with a refusal, as the owner declared that he could have them photographed himself, and thereby become a celebrated man. Determined not to be thus foiled, Maltzan made another effort, backed by the influence of the English Governor of Malta, and this time he succeeded. Overjoyed at his success, he sent immediately to Malta for a photographer and apparatus, but on their arrival the young man changed his mind, and withdrew the permission with the declaration that it was his intention to publish a set of photographs of the inscriptions on his own account. So Maltzan was obliged to be contented with bringing away copies, of which he obtained about sixty. Among these are the most important cologonic inscriptions found in the museum of the castle of Mamuba, and the only tomb inscription found in modern times, also from the same place. To these may be added some very valuable ones from an ancient museum of Carthage, and also a few from the maritime port of Clupea.

It appears that the fortunate possessor of these relics sent some of them to Paris to the great Exhibition of 1867, with the assurance that he had a great many more. From the character of these it was suspected that he knew nothing about their intrinsic value, and had only chosen those that struck his fancy as being the most presentable for the Exposition, therefore the ardent desire of Maltzan to get a sight of these antiquities that had never been subjected to the investigation of any one skilled in ancient inscriptions. Most of those sent were in reality figures in the common style of art, awkward and childish, and containing but few inscriptions. It was quite evident that they were sent because they pleased the rude fancy of their possessor, and it turned out that he had about one hundred and fifty in all, some of them of rare value to the archæologist.

The discovery of these induced Maltzan to make a tour through the provinces of Tunis, which he did under the protection of the Bey, on account of his letters from the Court of Prussia. This portion of Africa possesses a very large amount of monumental souvenirs of the great periods of its past. The monuments of the remotest period—that of the Phœnician and Carthaginians—are becoming very rare. The ruins of Carthage can now scarcely be called such, for only a lively fancy can discover them. But learned investigation, incited by the finding of these numerous inscriptions, will turn with renewed interest to this scene of a wonderful history. The indications of Roman rule are very abundant, and the joy that is experienced in wandering among these relics, and reveling successively with the remains of the Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, and Byzantines, as well as those of the followers of the Prophet from Mecca, fully repays the traveler for the indignities received from the native Moslems.

The comparison between the past and the present is a sad one. Islamism has stripped these regions of every bloom, and has turned into a desert what was once a fertile garden. The inhabitants have lost all sense of the past; the ruins of the ancient Carthaginians and Romans are for them nothing but old stones which they at least do not destroy as a matter of principle. In one respect there is not the least difference between Tunis and Tripoli: they are both suffering under the most exhausting Turkish despotism. The whole system of government seems reduced to robbery, which Turkish officials understand how to practice with incredible cunning. Even the judges are said to regard their positions as facilities for extortion; he who can offer the most, obtains the judgment in his favor. The people, therefore, seem to care to do but little more than live from hand to mouth, for the fruits of their labor would be literally expressed from them by their rulers. They thus succumb to poverty as to fatalism.

Tripoli is at the present time more favored than Tunis in having a ruler more considerate toward his people, and at the same time more efficient in the art of ruling. This arises partly from the fact that he is not a Turk but an Algerian Arab, and is thus in closer communion with the population than his predecessors, and he has succeeded in making the thought of the Turkish yoke at least bearable to his people. He was educated in France, and has thereby acquired some ideas of humanity, and has consequently taken quite an interest in various efforts at reform. But they have unfortunately all failed, because undertaken without any connection with each other, and without any adequate preparation for their exe-

and Carthaginians are becoming very rare. The ruins of Carthage can now scarcely be called such, for only a lively fancy can discover them. But learned investigation, incited by the finding of these numerous inscriptions, will turn with renewed interest to the scene of a wonderful history. The indications of Roman rule are very abundant, and the joy that is experienced in wandering among these relics, and meeting successively with the remains of the Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, and Byzantines, as well as those of the followers of the Prophet from Mecca, fully repays the traveler for the indignities received from the native Moslems.

The comparison between the past and the present is a sad one. Islamism has stripped these regions of every bloom, and has turned into a desert what was once a fertile garden. The inhabitants have lost all sense of the past; the ruins of the ancient Carthaginians and Romans are for them nothing but old stones which they at least do not destroy as a matter of principle. In this respect there is not the least difference between Tunis and Tripoli: they are both suffering under the most exhausting Turkish despotism. The whole system of government seems reduced to robbery, which Turkish officials understand how to practice with incredible cunning. Even the judges are said to regard their positions as facilities for extortion; he who can offer the most, obtains the judgment in his favor. The people, therefore, seem to care to do but little more than live from hand to mouth, for the fruits of their labor would be literally squeezed from them by their rulers. They thus succumb to poverty and to fatalism.

Tripoli is at the present time more favored than Tunis in having a ruler more considerate toward his people, and at the same time more efficient in the art of ruling. This arises partly from the fact that he is not a Turk but an Algerian Arab, and is thus in closer communion with the population than his predecessors, and he has succeeded in making the thought of the Turkish yoke at least bearable to his people. He was educated in France, and has thereby acquired some ideas of humanity, and has consequently taken quite an interest in various efforts at reform. But they have unfortunately all failed, because undertaken without any connection with each other, and without any adequate preparation for their excution or continuance. But personally he is a humane ruler, with a great aversion to pompous Oriental extravagance, and with quite a desire and capacity to harmonize and co-operate with Europeans. And of late he has had ample opportunity to do this on account of the European expeditions fitted out in this port to penetrate into Central Africa.

Nearly all the German expeditions of late years to these mysterious regions, under the control of Barth, Vogel, Overweg, Beurmann, Rohlfs, and the unfortunate one of the singular Alexandrine Tinné, have made Tripoli their objective point. The limits of our article will permit us to make nothing more than incidental mention of these, as we find it necessary, in view of space and system, to confine ourselves to the northern coast of Africa. It is well known, however, that several of these expeditions were very successful in making their way from Tripoli across Fezzan *via* Mourzook, its capital, and over the desert of Sahara at its narrowest point, to Lake Tsad and the kingdom of Bornou, in Central Africa. These explorers sometimes undertook their dangerous task almost single-handed; and again, under the auspices of geographical associations or the patronage of the Government. But they were all greatly gratified at finding an unexpectedly warm and generous welcome at the hands of the sable Sultan of Bornou. There thus gradually grew up a feeling of friendship between the negro ruler and his German visitors; and finally he felt inclined to send a few characteristic presents to the Prussian King with words of amity. These were, of course, graciously received, and King William could do no less than reciprocate these courtesies. This it was resolved to carry out in a style that would impress the Sultan by the magnificence and beauty of the presents sent; and it was consequently resolved to organize a new expedition to bear them to Bornou, with a view of impressing the principal ruler of Soudan with the power and generosity of his friend.

The charge of organizing this expedition was intrusted to Rohlfs, as the man who, by his practical character and experience, would be most likely to put it successfully under way. And for this purpose he proceeded to Tripoli, as a government agent, and presented his credentials to the ruling Pasha to whom we have already alluded. The latter heartily zation or continuance. But personally he is a humane ruler, with a great aversion to pompous Oriental extravagance, and with quite a desire and capacity to fraternize and cooperate with Europeans. And of late he has had ample opportunity to do this on account of the European expeditions fitted out in this part to penetrate into Central Africa.

Nearly all the German expeditions of late years to these mysterious regions, under the control of Barth, Vogel, Overweg, Beurmann, Rohlfs, and the unfortunate one of the singular Alexandrine Tinné, have made Tripoli their objective point. The limits of our article will permit us to make nothing more than incidental mention of these, as we find it necessary, in view of space and system, to confine ourselves to the northern coast of Africa. It is well known, however, that several of these expeditions were very successful in making their way from Tripoli across Fezzan via Mourzouk, its capital, and over the desert of Sahara at its narrowest point, to Lake Tsad and the Kingdom of Bornou, in Central Africa. These explorers sometimes undertook their dangerous task almost single-handed; and again, under the auspices of geographical associations or the patronage of the Government. But they were all greatly gratified at finding an unexpectedly warm and gracious welcome at the hands of the sable Sultan of Bornou. There thus gradually grew up a feeling of friendship between the negro ruler and his German visitors; and finally he felt inclined to send a few characteristic presents to the Prussian King with words of amity. These were, of course, graciously received, and King William could do no less than reciprocate these courtesies. This it was resolved to carry out in a style that would impress the Sultan by the magnificence and beauty of the presents sent; and it was consequently resolved to organize a new expedition to bear them to Bornou, with a view of impressing the principal ruler of Soudan with the power and generosity of his friend.

The charge of organizing this expedition was intrusted to Rohlfs, as the man who, by his practical character and experience, would be most likely to get it successfully under way. And for this purpose he proceeded to Tripoli, as a government agent, and presented his credentials to the ruling Pasha to whom we have already alluded. The latter heartily sympathized in the enterprise, and seemed proud to have relations with the agents of the German Government, and so Rohlfs had a fair field for his labor, which was quite a responsible one, in view of the dangerous journeying over the desert with his valuable gifts. These consisted of a throne, needle-guns, a telescope, a chronometer, watches, portraits of the royal family, essence of roses, genuine corals, silks, cloths, and velvets.

We need hardly say that these would be sore temptations to the wandering, thieving Arabs and vagabonds of the desert, and that it would be quite impossible to hide their value from them—indeed, they would be more than likely greatly to exaggerate this. It would consequently be absolutely necessary to have a most determined leader and band to protect these treasures, and convey them to their destination. But to obtain these was no easy task. Rohlfs, on his way to Tripoli, had resolved to seek out and engage a loyal Arab chief and traveler of extensive experience for this enterprise. But on his arrival he learned that Mohammed Gatroni had disappeared on some expedition, and was not to be found in all Fezzan. In this dilemma, Rohlfs, by the advice of Maltzan, who was then in Tripoli in the interest of his inscriptions, resolved, with the consent of the Prussian Government, to appoint Dr. Nachtigal leader of the expedition, as Rohlfs himself had explored the entire country and preferred making some new explorations to undertaking a mere diplomatic service. This Doctor Nachtigal was a Prussian subject in the service of the Bey of Tunis as his court physician, and just the man in this capacity to make a pleasant impression on the Sultan of Bornou.

Nachtigal, however, was unwilling to undertake the enterprise unless he could fit out an expedition which, under the patronage that he hoped to obtain from the monarch of Soudan, would enable him to penetrate into Southern or Central Africa, and learn something more about these regions, in the interest of the government that employed him. This caused a delay of several months for preparation, during which time Rohlfs was obliged patiently to wait. But he took advantage of this delay to equip himself for another expedition along the northern coast as far as Alexandria, which we shall presently give in detail. When Nachtigal was nearly ready to start, sympathized in the enterprise, and seemed proud to have relations with the agents of the German Government; and so Rohlfs had a fair field for his labor, which was quite a responsible one, in view of the dangerous journeying over the desert with his valuable gifts. These consisted of a throne, needle-guns, a telescope, a chronometer, watches, portraits of the royal family, scenes of wars, genuine swords, silks, cloths, and velvets.

We need hardly say that these would be sore temptations to the wandering, thieving Arabs and vagabonds of the desert, and that it would be quite impossible to hide their value from them—indeed, they would be more than likely greatly to exaggerate this. It would consequently be absolutely necessary to have a most determined leader and band to protect these treasures, and convey them to their destination. But to obtain these was no easy task. Rohlfs, on his way to Tripoli, had resolved to seek out and engage a loyal Arab chief and traveler of extensive experience for this enterprise. But on his arrival he learned that Mohammed Gatroni had disappeared on some expedition, and was not to be found in all Fezzan. In this dilemma, Rohlfs, by the advice of Maltzan, who was then in Tripoli in the interest of his investigations, resolved, with the consent of the Prussian Government, to appoint Dr. Nachtigal leader of the expedition, as Rohlfs himself had explored the entire country, and preferred making some new explorations to undertaking a mere diplomatic service. This Doctor Nachtigal was a Prussian subject in the service of the Bey of Tunis as his court physician, and just the man in this capacity to make a pleasant impression on the Sultan of Bornou.

Nachtigal, however, was unwilling to undertake the enterprise unless he could fit out an expedition which, under the patronage that he hoped to obtain from the monarch of Bornou, would enable him to penetrate into Southern or Central Africa and learn something more about these regions, in the interest of the government that employed him. This caused a delay of several months for preparations, during which time Rohlfs was obliged patiently to wait. But he took advantage of the delay to equip himself for another expedition along the northern coast as far as Alexandria, which we shall presently give in detail. When Nachtigal was nearly ready to start

Rohlfs was one day surprised to see Gatroni riding grandly into Tripoli high on his charger, and proud of the task that he heard was awaiting him, proving by his presence that the story of his disappearance was an error. Rohlfs immediately resolved to put the expedition under charge of both of them, Nachtigal as diplomatic agent, and Gatroni as military leader.

Finally Nachtigal arrived at Tripoli with his stately caravan, whose ostentation impressed the natives and set the Europeans in a fever of delight at the sight of an official German act on the shores of Africa. The whole colony was in a state of lively excitement at the event, and looked on with astonishment as the North German flag was raised above a caravan that was to bear it officially into the heart of Africa, plant it on the residence of a Christian in the capital of Bornou, and probably transport it in triumph through Central Africa to the Indian or the Atlantic Ocean. It was thought that this significant act should not be initiated without a solemn ceremony that would impress the natives. On the day of the departure of the caravan, therefore, Rohlfs invited all the consuls and the principal officials and families of the city to be present at a farewell festival. The guests appeared punctually at the border of a forest of palms, where Nachtigal had pitched his tent and the camels were resting beside the baggage. Here a festive pic-nic, consisting of sheep roasted whole in Arabian style, and many other delicacies of the season and the country, was bountifully served. The Consul of the Netherlands offered a toast to the health of King William, others drank to the success of the expedition, and all were in a jubilant state, when Rohlfs started off an impromptu dance on the green in European style. The merry capering so delighted the sober Moslems that Gatroni vowed by the head of the Prophet that on his return from Bornou he would without delay proceed direct to Prussia.

On the next morning the caravan began its march, and Rohlfs, in the happy consciousness of having intrusted the royal presents to safe hands, returned to Tripoli to prepare for his own departure. But the experience of the expedition was by no means all smooth. In passing through Fezzan it was so annoyed by the wandering hordes of this great oasis that it was finally obliged to halt at its capital, Mourzook. Here it was

Rohlfs was one day surprised to see Gerhard riding proudly into Tripoli high on his dromedary, and proud of the news that he heard was awaiting him, proving by his presence that the story of his disappearance was an error. Rohlfs immediately resolved to put the expedition under charge of both of them, Nachtigal as diplomatic agent, and Gerhard as military leader.

Finally Nachtigal arrived at Tripoli with his stately caravan, whose ostentation impressed the natives and set the Europeans in a fever of delight at the sight of an official German set up on the shores of Africa. The whole colony was in a state of lively excitement at the event, and looked on with astonishment as the North German flag was raised above a caravan that was to bear it officially into the heart of Africa, plant it on the residence of a Christian in the capital of Bornou, and probably transport it in triumph through Central Africa to the Indian or the Atlantic Ocean. It was thought that this significant act should not be initiated without a solemn ceremony that would impress the natives. On the day of the departure of the caravan, therefore, Rohlfs invited all the consuls and the principal officials and families of the city to be present at a farewell festival. The guests appeared punctually at the borders of a forest of palms, where Nachtigal had pitched his tent and the camels were resting beside the baggage. Here a festive pic-nic, consisting of sheep roasted whole in Arabian style, and many other delicacies of the region and the country, was bountifully served. The Consul of the Netherlands offered a toast to the health of King William, others drank to the success of the expedition, and all were in a jubilant state, when Rohlfs started off an impromptu dance on the green in European style. The merry evening so delighted the sober Moslem that Gatroni vowed by the head of the Prophet that on his return from Bornou he would without delay proceed direct to Prussia.

On the next morning the caravan began its march, and Rohlfs, in the happy consciousness of having intrusted the royal presents to safe hands, returned to Tripoli to prepare for his own departure. But the progress of the expedition was by no means all smooth. In passing through Fezzan it was so annoyed by the wandering hordes of this great oasis that it was finally obliged to halt at its capital, Mourzouk. Here it was besieged for a time until it obtained reinforcements from some loyal tribes; and the matter of sending a company of Prussians with needle-guns was even seriously mooted in Germany, for the fame of these warriors and their weapons in the campaign of 1866 had even reached the interior of Africa, and a few of them would have put ten thousand of the enemy to flight. Arrangements were finally made that justified them in starting, and after a difficult and perilous journey they at last arrived safely at Kuka, the capital of Bornou. Some months ago the German geographers in solemn session had a grand time over the accounts sent to them by Nachtigal of his reception by the Sultan. He approached the royal residence in company with a Turkish embassador, and the Sultan's oldest son came out to meet him with a princely retinue, adorned with the colors of the rainbow, and armed with every weapon that they could command. Nachtigal's presentation to the negro prince was a perfect triumph, and his gilded throne and needle-guns were regarded with admiration and wonder; the famous guns receiving the most distinguished place in the royal arsenal.

With this episode we return to Rohlfs, to follow him on a deeply interesting journey from Tripoli along the northern coast to Alexandria, with a view to spy out the land for colonization under the impulses of the Suez Canal and the resurrection of the German empire, and the remarkable foothold that the latter power by these peaceful and scientific expeditions is likely to acquire.

His first objective point was the region around Cyrene, a district east of Tripoli, which the Turkish Government in vain endeavored to colonize by force, with a view to profit by the opening of the Canal of Suez. The way thither lies over Bengasi and around the great Gulf of Sidra, which at this point approaches very near the desert. After the rainy season this route is almost impassable and sometimes absolutely dangerous. It seems as if the sea extended its watery arm far into the interior, and was desirous of reaching the desert itself. Rohlfs maintains that comparatively slight excavations and canaling would give the sea ready access to the Great Desert, and turn it into one mighty inland sea; and he was obliged to cross the gulf in a vessel, and thus reach Bengasi, on account of the inundation of the sea into the land.

Bengasi is a flourishing city of fifteen thousand inhabitants, of whom no less than two thousand are Europeans. Their import and export trade is large, though Rohlfs asserts that the latter is mainly composed of negro slaves. The city itself is of intense interest to the antiquarian and historian on account of the high position that it assumes in classical history. This place is doubtless the site of the ancient gardens of the Hesperides. These have disappeared, but the blooming landscape explains to us the charm that filled the ancients with ecstasy. Rohlfs declares that this whole region, as well as that of all Northern Africa, has degenerated in the course of centuries in regard to its vegetable world. But the river of Lethe is found here just as it has been described by the ancient geographers, only it is now more insignificant, probably from the fact that the entire region has become drier.

After landing at Bengasi, Rohlfs pursued his way along the coast, though much annoyed by incessant rains and storms. Luxurious vegetation from the fertile soil presented to the eye the most beautiful pictures, and the ruins met with at every step led back his thoughts to the early history of the country. The dilapidated tombs at times afforded them a refuge from the violent storms, and occasionally they were obliged to pass the night in the stone graves of the men of earlier ages, to experience a bodily resurrection on the following morning. These tombs become more numerous as one approaches Cyrene, and in the cavernous mountains near the city the caravan passed for miles among the tombs of vanished multitudes of the former population—a city of the dead in the truest sense of the word. This is Cyrene, once the most flourishing colony of the Greeks in Northern Africa. When Alexander the Great visited the shrine of Jupiter Ammon, the Cyrenians voluntarily yielded to him and sent him valuable presents: in the year ninety-six they went over to the Romans: and at a later epoch it must have become an immense city. In its flourishing period the Jews were very powerful; they once rose in rebellion and murdered 200,000 Romans and Cyrenians. This led to the downfall of a city that had been renowned for the arts and sciences, and which gave birth to a number of distinguished men. This pride of antiquity is now nothing but a heap of ruins—a great collection of dilapidated tombs.

Bengasi is a flourishing city of fifteen thousand inhabitants, of whom no less than two thousand are Europeans. Their import and export trade is large, though Rohlfs asserts that the latter is mainly composed of negro slaves. The city itself is of intense interest to the antiquarian and historian on account of the high position that it occupies in classical history. This place is doubtless the site of the ancient gardens of the Hesperides. These have disappeared, but the blooming landscape explains to us the charm that filled the ancients with ecstasy. Rohlfs declares that this whole region, as well as that of all Northern Africa, has degenerated in the course of centuries in regard to its vegetable world. But the river of Lethe is found here just as it has been described by the ancient geographers, only it is now more insignificant, probably from the fact that the entire region has become drier.

After landing at Bengasi, Rohlfs pursued his way along the coast, though much annoyed by incessant rains and storms. Luxurious vegetation from the fertile soil presented to the eye the most beautiful pictures, and the ruins met with at every step led back his thoughts to the early history of the country. The dilapidated tombs at times afforded them a refuge from the violent storms, and occasionally they were obliged to pass the night in the stone graves of the men of earlier ages, to experience a bodily resurrection on the following morning. These tombs became more numerous as one approaches Cyrene, and in the cavernous mountains near the city the caravan passed for miles among the tombs of vanished multitudes of the former population—a city of the dead in the truest sense of the word. This is Cyrene, once the most flourishing colony of the Greeks in Northern Africa. When Alexander the Great visited the shrine of Jupiter Ammon, the Cyrenians voluntarily yielded to him and sent him valuable presents; in the year ninety-six they went over to the Romans; and at a later epoch it must have become an autonomous city. In its flourishing period the Jews were very powerful; they once rose in rebellion and murdered 200,000 Romans and Cyrenians. This led to the downfall of a city that had been renowned for the arts and sciences, and which gave birth to a number of distinguished men. This pride of antiquity is now nothing but a heap of ruins—a great collection of dilapidated tombs.

It is now a question whether this condition is to last always. It would seem that this beautiful region, with its capability for gardens and fruits such as enchanted the ancients, can scarcely be allowed to remain a stranger to the humanizing influences of the age. German geographers, with the famous Carl Ritter at their head, have long recommended the land for European colonization, and regretted that some one of the continental powers has not founded a colony there. Rohlfs now considers it just the spot to build up a flourishing port for the road across the desert to inner Africa, and, were he not so opposed to government colonization, would warmly recommend his countrymen to acquire it, if possible, and guide emigration thither. There can be little doubt that the completion of the Suez Canal is to give new life to all the Mediterranean coast, and especially to the northern shore of Africa. The great ancient course of commerce between the gorgeous and wealthy Orient and the wonder-loving nations of Southern Europe is about to be restored, with the advantage of continuous water communication from one extremity to the other. The effect of this revival of Oriental trade on the shores of the Mediterranean will be to renew the activity that for thousands of years has only lived in story. And this revival will take place under the auspices of the mightiest modern ally to commerce—that of steam.

And the lovers of the race hope that this phenix will celebrate greater triumphs than those of arms or diplomacy, for these have, again and again, tried in vain to give new life to the African shores; these and the lands of the Adriatic and the Bosphorus have lain comparatively dormant for ages, until the talismanic wand bid the steam-propelled vessel leave the shores of the classic seas of ancient times direct for the wealthy ports of distant Cathay. And still an abiding faith ever animated the breasts of classical scholars and scientific geographers that the past glory of the Mediterranean must return in its ancient splendor, and among the most confiding of these were the German explorers, from the great Barth, so famous for his African expeditions, down to Rohlfs, who is now thrilling his countrymen with the interest of his recitals and the boldness of his conceptions. He contends that Africa is the field for the future, and that with the advantages now opening

It is now a question whether this condition is to last always. It would seem that this beautiful region, with its capability for gardens and fruits such as rendered the ancient, can scarcely be allowed to remain a stranger to the humanizing influences of the age. German geographers, with the famous Carl Ritter at their head, have long recommended the land for European colonization, and regretted that some one of the continental powers has not founded a colony there. Rohlfs now considers it just the spot to build up a flourishing post for the road across the desert to Inner Africa, and, were he not so opposed to government colonization, would warmly recommend his countrymen to acquire it, if possible, and guide emigration thither. There can be little doubt that the completion of the Suez Canal is to give new life to all the Mediterranean coast, and especially to the northern shore of Africa. The great ancient course of commerce between the gorgeous and wealthy Orient and the wonder-loving nations of Southern Europe is about to be restored, with the advantages of continuous water communication from one extremity to the other. The effect of this revival of Oriental trade on the shores of the Mediterranean will be to renew the activity that for thousands of years has only lived in story. And this revival will take place under the auspices of the mightiest modern ally to commerce — that of steam.

And the lovers of the race hope that this pluck will celebrate greater triumphs than those of arms or diplomacy, for these have, again and again, tried in vain to give new life to the African shores; these and the lands of the Atlantic and the Hesperides have lain comparatively dormant for ages, until the talismanic wand bid the steam-propelled vessel leave the shores of the classic seas of ancient times direct for the wealthy ports of distant Cathay. And still an abiding faith ever animated the breasts of classical scholars and scientific geographers that the past glory of the Mediterranean must return in its ancient splendor, and among the most confiding of these were the German explorers, from the great Barth, so famous for his African expeditions, down to Rohlfs, who is now thrilling his countrymen with the interest of his reports and the boldness of his conceptions. He contends that Africa is the field for the future, and that with the advantages now opening to its northern coast, that no region of the globe offers finer opportunities to the Germans for commercial triumphs. Any other he repudiates. He is opposed to dependent colonies, and points to nearly all that now exist as failures. England is tired of Canada, Spain is annoyed to death with Cuba, Russia has sold Alaska, and other powers, such as Denmark, would gladly dispose of what they have in distant seas. England has been rich and powerful through India, but the desire to retain this mighty land now makes England a coward in her intercourse with foreign powers, for manifest destiny points to no remote period when India must be free, if it does not fall into the hands of Russia.

Rohlfs' theory, therefore, is, that Germany will do best to establish amicable relations with Africa, the only land unoccupied by Europeans that remains open to them, by the establishment of naval and commercial ports at important outlets, and thus through these open up paths of internal trade that will lead them to the untold wealth of that rich and extensive country in Central Africa which he thinks might in time be made a German India by peaceful means. To these ports he would encourage German emigration, and protect it by their power and influence; but would give to it an independent position that would throw it on its own resources, and give it pride and strength in developing independent life. This system would largely develop German mercantile interests without involving a necessary development of a navy to protect colonies. A marine that could look after the interests of the various trading stations would be all that would be absolutely necessary, as Germany, with her present inland boundaries, can never expect to be a first-class naval power.

The scientific explorations of Africa by German *savants* and travelers have put their country in possession of much valuable knowledge, and the friendly relations established with the Sultan of Bornou is an opening wedge to much closer associations. A commercial route from Tripoli or Bengasi across the desert of Sahara, is, in the opinion of Rohlfs, quite practicable, and he is intimately acquainted with every mile of the way. He then recommends the establishment of a trading and naval station at the mouth of the Niger, as a southern outlet for the commerce from Bornou, which might

be protected in the interior by the establishment of military posts in connection with the friendly Sultan of Soudan. In addition to these, he recommends also the establishment of commercial ports at the principal river outlets of the western coast, and points out a feasible line of trade right across Central Africa from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea. He repeatedly alludes to the immense wealth of these regions, abounding in ivory, gold, precious woods, diamonds, and all that goes to make up our most exalted conceptions of fairy land.

In short, Africa presents almost a *carte-blanche* to the world, and for years the Germans have been quietly mapping it out without as yet reaping any advantage from their labors. But it would seem that a higher Power has been directing these men, that their labors might be well advanced at the moment when the Mediterranean is to receive new life, and their own nation, in its resurrection, has acquired the strength and the inclination to go peacefully up and possess this rich land as one of promise to them and to the world. And as they proceed on their scientific and commercial missions, they must inevitably be accompanied by the soldiers of the Cross to make conquests for the one true God, and advance the cause of Christian civilization.

ART. V.—TWO SYSTEMS OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

THE near approach of another General Conference seems to call for some fresh public review of the theory, state, and needs of ministerial education in the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a useful introduction to such a review, we propose, in the present paper, to state and examine the two great historic systems which antedate, and in important respects antagonize, the Methodistic.

A word as to the origin of the three, for here lies the philosophy of all their differences.

In devising schemes of ministerial education, Churches naturally proceed from their own particular view of the ministerial call and office. Churches greatly differing as to what a Chrisbe protected in the interior by the establishment of military posts in connection with the friendly Sultan of Soudan. In addition to these, he recommends also the establishment of commercial ports at the principal river outlets of the western coast, and points out a feasible line of trade right across Central Africa from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea. He repeatedly alludes to the immense wealth of these regions, abounding in ivory, gold, precious woods, diamonds, and all that goes to make up our most exalted conceptions of fairy land.

In short, Africa presents almost a *terra incognita* to the world, and for years the Germans have been quietly mapping it out without as yet reaping any advantage from their labors. But it would seem that a higher Power has been directing these men, that their labors might be well advanced at the moment when the Mediterranean is to receive new life, and their own nation, in its reformation, has acquired the strength and the inclination to go peacefully up and possess this rich land as one of promise to them and to the world. And as they proceed on their scientific and commercial missions, they must inevitably be accompanied by the soldiers of the Cross to make conquests for the one true God, and advance the cause of Christian civilization.

Art. V.—TWO SYSTEMS OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

The near approach of another General Conference seems to call for some fresh public review of the theory, state, and needs of ministerial education in the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a useful introduction to such a review, we propose, in the present paper, to state and examine the two great historic systems which antedate, and in important respects antagonize, the Methodistic.

A word as to the origin of the three, for here lies the philosophy of all their differences.

In devising schemes of ministerial education, Churches naturally proceed from their own particular view of the ministerial call and office. Churches greatly differing as to what a Christian minister should be, cannot be expected to agree as to the best method of educating ministers. Of these theories of the call there are in reality but three: the Roman Catholic, the State Church Protestant, and the Methodistic. According to the Roman Catholic theory it is the business of "the Holy Church" to call men to the ministry; all they have to do is to accept the call. According to the State Church Protestant theory men are to call themselves to this profession as to any other; all the Church has to do is to accept of such as come. According to the Methodistic theory the call must come from God, and be ratified both by the man and by the Church. Out of these radically different conceptions of the call have naturally sprung the three diverse systems of ministerial education. How naturally we shall see, as we examine them in order.

First, then, the Romish system. Under normal circumstances the Roman Catholic Church selects her future priest when he is but twelve years old. At that impressible period she adopts him as her son, puts her robe upon him, lodges him in her own house, feeds him at her own table, instructs him in her own school, secludes him in the cloistered solitude of her *seminarium clericorum* from all the cares, distractions, and turmoils of the wicked world without. After eleven years of careful oversight, instruction, and training, during which time the youth has passed through the four lower orders of the ministry, she ordains him a deacon, and two years later an elder of the "Holy Catholic Church." Such is the Papal system of ministerial education, wherever that Church is free to carry out the provisions of the twenty-third session, eighteenth chapter, of the Decrees of the Council of Trent. It may be briefly characterized in one sentence as follows: Thirteen years of purely professional discipline—the pupil being meantime secluded from all contact with secular life, subjected to unintermitting ecclesiastical oversight, supported by the Church, in the Church, and for the Church.

The theory and practice of the Protestant State Churches afford us an almost perfect contrast to this Papal system. That theory of the State which requires the Government to provide the people with a religion, requires it also to provide them with education. If the State must build churches and support clergymen, it certainly must erect schools and salary

schoolmasters. Hence in the ideal or perfect State, the Church, according to this theory, has nothing to do with education, the Church and the school being both alike subordinated to the State. As a matter of fact, the parochial or primary schools in State Church countries have always remained under more or less of ecclesiastical supervision and influence, but the emancipation of all higher institutions, particularly the university, has been complete. As a rule, these higher institutions have not only enjoyed great corporational independence of the Church, but have also been responsible in their administration solely to the educational bureau of the government. Thus the Church, possessing no schools in her own right and under her own control, can of course do nothing toward educating young men to supply her prospective wants. As fast as vacancies occur she must supply them with such men as offer. These, of course, looking forward to such employment for a livelihood, prepare themselves just as they would for any other occupation. They study until they think they can pass the examination required before they can be admitted to orders, and then present themselves as candidates for the holy office. Up to the time of this presentation the Church has nothing to do with the business. The candidate calls himself, studies in institutions not under the control of the Church, selects his instructors, none of whom are, as such, amenable to the Church, keeps such company as he pleases, conducts himself as he likes. Four to six years in a preparatory school and three in the university complete his academic and professional training. In this system, in the place of cloistered seclusion we have indiscriminate association with all the world ; in the place of rigid scholastic discipline, boundless personal license; in the place of spiritual watch-care, the completest ecclesiastical abandonment.

Both of these systems have their palpable excellences and defects. Each needs to be criticised in the light of the other, and a clear view of their respective deficiencies will the better qualify us to appreciate the excellences of the third, or Methodistic, system.

In the first place the Papal system excels, and the State Church system is defective, in the matter of *attaching the student to the Church, identifying him with her interests, winning for her his love.* Here is one of the grand secrets of Rome's schoolmasters. Hence in the ideal or perfect State the Church, according to this theory, has nothing to do with education, the Church and the school being both alike subordinated to the State. As a matter of fact, the parochial or primary schools in State Church countries have always remained under more or less of ecclesiastical supervision and influence; but the emancipation of all higher institutions, particularly the university, has been complete. As a rule, these higher institutions have not only enjoyed great corporational independence of the Church, but have also been responsible in their administration solely to the educational bureau of the government. Thus the Church, possessing no schools in her own right and under her own control, can of course do nothing toward educating young men to supply her prospective wants. As fast as vacancies occur she must supply them with such men as offer. These, of course, looking forward to such employment for a livelihood, prepare themselves just as they would for any other occupation. They study until they think they can pass the examination required before they can be admitted to orders, and then present themselves as candidates for the holy office. Up to the time of this presentation the Church has nothing to do with the business. The candidate calls himself, studies in institutions not under the control of the Church, selects his instructors, none of whom are, as such, amenable to the Church, keeps such company as he pleases, conducts himself as he likes. Four to six years in a preparatory school and three in the university completes his academic and professional training. In this system, in the place of cloistered seclusion we have indiscriminate association with all the world; in the place of rigid scholastic discipline, boundless personal license; in the place of spiritual watch-care, the completest ecclesiastical abandonment.

Both of these systems have their palpable excellences and defects. Each needs to be criticised in the light of the other, and a clear view of their respective deficiencies will the better qualify us to appreciate the excellences of the third, or Methodistic, system.

In the first place the Papal system excels and the State Church system is defective, in the matter of attaching the student to the Church, *identifying him with her interests, interesting her for his fate.* Here is one of the great secrets of Roman power. Some have sought it in the celibacy of her priesthood, and have said, because these men have neither wife nor children to absorb their affections, they live for the Church alone; because they have no social ties, they make the Church their home, their state, their fatherland. But the grand question is, Whence this celibacy? Whence this willingness to sacrifice the delights of a Christian home, the privileges of normal citizenship, the personal liberty of manhood? The measure is not enforced by lash or sword. Only in the rarest instances is it done by the spiritual terrorization of the superior. In more than nine cases out of ten the law is doubtless complied with from pure devotion to the Church, and from an implicit, childlike faith in her teachings. Could any Protestant State Church enforce a measure requiring equal self-sacrifice on the part of her clergy? The difference of power in the two cases finds its explanation in the different degrees of attachment felt by the clergy for their respective Churches. The attachment which a State Church clergyman feels toward his Church is like that felt by an agent toward a grand, all-monopolizing corporation which employs him; that felt by the Romish priest toward his Church is a compound of the devotion of a son with that of a lover, the whole leavened through and through with romantic poetico-religious enthusiasm. The foundation of this devotion was laid back there in the clerical seminary. There the Church was first a mother to him, then a bride. She gave him all he has, taught him all he knows, offers him all he hopes or wishes. Why should he not love her?

Now this success in winning for the Church the warm affections of the student is a feature which ought to be found in every system. It is right that the future servant of the Church should love the Church. It is desirable that he should appreciate and love the peculiarities of that branch with which he is to labor. He will be the more useful if this attachment be strong and his devotion ardent. Here, then, is the first excellency of the Catholic, and the first deficiency of the State Church Protestant, system of clerical education.

The second excellency of the Papal, and the second deficiency of the State Church Prostestant, system is found in the matter of *control over the studies of the candidate.* Under the State Church system, as we have seen, the Church has no con-power. Some have sought it in the celibacy of her priesthood, and have said, because these men have neither wife nor children to absorb their affections, they live for the Church alone; because they have no social ties, they make the Church their home, their state, their fatherland. But the grand question is, Whence this celibacy? Whence this willingness to sacrifice the delights of a Christian home, the privileges of natural citizenship, the personal liberty of manhood? The measure is not enforced by law or sword. Only in the rarest instances is it done by the spiritual compulsion of the superior. In more than nine cases out of ten the law is doubtless complied with from pure devotion to the Church, and from an implicit childlike faith in her teachings. Could any Protestant State Church enforce a measure requiring equal self-sacrifice on the part of her clergy? The difference of power in the two cases finds its explanation in the different degrees of attachment felt by the clergy for their respective Churches. The attachment which a State Church clergyman feels toward his Church is like that felt by an agent toward a grand, all-monopolizing corporation which employs him; that felt by the Romish priest toward his Church is a compound of the devotion of a son with that of a lover, the whole leavened through and through with romantic poetico-religious enthusiasm. The foundation of this devotion was laid back there in the clerical seminary. There the Church was first a mother to him, then a bride. She gave him all he has, taught him all he knows, offers him all he hopes or wishes. Why should he not love her?

Now this success in winning for the Church the warm affections of the student is a feature which ought to be found in every system. It is right that the future servant of the Church should love the Church. It is desirable that he should appreciate and love the peculiarities of that branch with which he is to labor. He will be the more useful if this attachment be strong and his devotion ardent. Here, then, is the first excellency of the Catholic, and the first deficiency of the State Church Protestant, system of clerical education.

The second excellency of the Papal, and the second deficiency of the State Church Protestant system is found in the matter of control over the studies of the candidate. Under the State Church system, as we have seen, the Church has no trol whatever in this respect. The student can study what he pleases, where he pleases, when he pleases, and how he pleases. The theological professors at the university can teach him Socinianism, or Puseyism, or Rationalism, or Pantheism, and the Church has no power either to remove the instructor or withdraw the pupil. In some States these very professors are, *ex officio*, the examining committee, appointed by the authorities to examine the candidates for admission to orders, in which case the Church is deprived even of the meager privilege of rejecting here and there a candidate trained under the hands of these ecclesiastically-irresponsible men. What a favorable contrast is presented us in the Roman system! Here every professor is amenable to the Church for the orthodoxy of his teachings. The Bishop stands at the head of the institution and supervises all the studies. The order of studies, the text-books to be used, the teachers to be employed—all these things can be duly looked after. The student is not abandoned to his own whims, but advised and directed. In fine, the authorities of the Church have, and exercise, a wise control over the whole plan of instruction, and see to it that neither professor nor student frustrate the great aim of the institution. This is as it should be.

Again, the Roman Catholic system excels, and the State Church system fails, *in the provision made for molding the character of the future man.* As regards the State Church system, we can hardly say that it makes any provision at all for this necessity. Where the system exists in its pure and unmitigated form, there is absolutely none. The young man is completely abandoned to himself and to surrounding influences. He is often a gambler, a wine-bibber, a duelist. The authorities of the Church have no more to do with him than if he were studying optics or the art of mining. As a matter of fact, the theological students at many universities have enjoyed the unenviable reputation of being the wildest, most dissipated, and licentious class attending the institution. Leaving the matter of personal piety altogether out of sight, the State Church system makes no provision to secure from the students a decent morality. Here, again, we see the superior wisdom of the Papal system. Once grant the correctness of the Catholic view of piety, and one can but admire the adaptation of the trol whatever in this respect. The student can study what he pleases, where he pleases, when he pleases, and how he pleases. The theological professors at the universities can teach Socinianism, or Pelagian, or Rationalism, or Pantheism, and the Church has no power either to remove the instructor or withdraw the pupil. In some cases these very professors are, ex officio, the examining committees appointed by the authorities to examine the candidates for admission to orders, in which case the Church is deprived even of the meagre privilege of rejecting here and there a candidate trained under the hands of these ecclesiastically irresponsible men. What a favorable contrast is presented us in the Roman system! Here every professor is amenable to the Church for the orthodoxy of his teachings. The Bishop stands at the head of the institution and supervises all the studies. The order of studies, the text-books to be used, the teachers to be employed—all these things can be duly looked after. The student is not abandoned to his own whims, but advised and directed. In fine, the authorities of the Church have, and exercise, a wise control over the whole plan of instruction, and see to it that neither professor nor student frustrate the great aim of the institution. This is as it should be.

Again, the Roman Catholic system excels, and the State Church system fails, in *the provision made for moulding the character of the future men*. As regards the State Church system, we can hardly say that it makes any provision at all for this necessity. Where the system exists in its pure and unmitigated form, there is absolutely none. The young man is completely abandoned to himself and to surrounding influences. He is often a gambler, a wine-bibber, a duelist. The authorities of the Church have no more to do with him than if he were studying optics or the art of bathing. As a matter of fact, the theological students at many universities have enjoyed the unenviable reputation of being the wildest, most dissipated, and licentious class attending the institution. Leaving the matter of personal piety altogether out of sight, the State Church system makes no provision to secure from the students a decent morality. Here, again, we see the superior wisdom of the Papal system. Once grant the correctness of the Catholic view of piety, and one can but admire the adaptation of the

Catholic training to develop it in their prospective priests. The authorities have a very distinct idea of the precise character desirable in their priests, and it cannot be denied that the influences of the *seminarium clericorum* are eminently successful in producing just such characters. Evangelical Churches have, of course, a very different conception of what is wanted in a Christian minister; but in adjusting their system of ministerial preparation they should endeavor to bring to bear upon the young candidate influences which will as effectually mold his character after the desired model as those of the Romish system do the young priests after their model. In this respect, therefore, the State Church Protestant system is utterly deficient.

Finally, the same unfortunate discrepancy is discoverable between the two systems in respect to the PRACTICAL *qualification of the candidate for his profession.* What little preparation the State-Church system gives the student is purely theoretical. It leaves him as utterly destitute of practical acquaintance with the duties of his calling as when he first commenced. He may have become a marvelous Hebraist, a profound theologian, a skillful polemic—he may have ranged through the whole field of sacred and ecclesiastical history, may have copied down whole books full of lectures on homiletics and pastoral theology—but after all he has never made an exhortation, never preached a sermon, never taken part in any public religious service whatever. Very likely he has never made a prayer in the hearing of others in all his life. As regards the practical part of his education he is as a child—he knows nothing about such things. In the Roman Catholic system it is not so. As soon as the prospective priest is big enough to ring the mass-bell, or swing a censer, or support the robe of an officiating father, he participates in the celebration of divine service. Before he enters his teens he knows all the vestments, all the genuflections, all the crossings and bowings, all the responses, all the taper-lightings and taper-extinguishings—in a word, all that pertains to Catholic worship. From that early date onward he is continually, one may say daily, connected with the celebration of divine worship. He learns to feel as much at home before the altar as in his dormitory. What wonder if, after his thirteen years of practical experience, Catholic training to develop it in their prospective priests. The authorities have a very distinct idea of the priestly character desirable in their priests, and it cannot be denied that the influences of the seminarian curriculum are eminently successful in producing just such character. Evangelical Churches have, of course, a very different conception of what is wanted in a Christian minister; but in adjusting their system of ministerial preparation they should endeavor to bring to bear upon the young candidate influences which will as effectually mould his character after the desired model as those of the Romish system do the young priests after their model. In this respect, therefore, the State-Church Protestant system is utterly deficient.

Finally, the same unfortunate discrepancy is discoverable between the two systems in respect to the *practical preparation of the candidate for his profession*. What little preparation the State-Church system gives the student is purely theoretical. It leaves him as utterly destitute of practical acquaintance with the duties of his calling as when he first commenced. He may have become a marvelous Hebraist, a profound theologian, a skillful polemic—he may have ranged through the whole field of sacred and ecclesiastical history, may have copied down whole books full of lectures on homiletics and pastoral theology—but after all he has never made an exhortation, never preached a sermon, never taken part in any public religious exercise whatever. Very likely he has never made a prayer in the hearing of others in all his life. As regards the practical part of his education he is as a child; he knows nothing about such things. In the Roman Catholic system it is not so. As soon as the prospective priest is big enough to ring the mass-bell, or carry a censer, or support the robe of an officiating priest, he participates in the celebration of divine service. Before he enters his teens he knows all the vestments, all the genuflexions, all the crossings and bowings, all the responses, all the tapers, altars, and other ecclesiology—in a word, all that pertains to Catholic worship. From that early date onward he is continually, one may say daily, connected with the celebration of divine worship. He learns to feel as much at home before the altar as in his dormitory. What wonder if, after his thirteen years of practical experience, he knows what his business is, knows it theoretically and practically?

The excellences of the Romish system, then, are these: It secures (1) the hearty devotion of the student to the Church; (2) a legitimate control over the theological instruction imparted to the student; (3) opportunity to mold the student's moral and religious character; and (4) the practical qualification of the student for his work. In each of these four particulars the State Church Protestant system is as defective as the Papal system is effective. Good men in the Protestant State Churches have always seen and lamented these deficiencies. Many are the efforts that have been made from time to time to remedy them, particularly in Germany. To remedy the lawlessness of the young theologues, and to win them to a sincere attachment to the Church, halls have been erected in connection with some universities. In these strict discipline was expected to mold the characters, and free board and pocket-money win the hearts, of the wayward candidates, but their success has not been great. To remedy the deficiency in point of practical training two measures have been more or less widely adopted: apprenticeship under an experienced pastor a year or more before becoming eligible to a cure, or a supplementary practical course of training in a so-called "seminary" devoted to this express work. These seminaries are of two kinds, some being entirely independent institutions, supplementary to the triennial theological course at the university, as for instance those at Willenberg, Loccum, Hanover, Herborn, etc.; others are connected with the universities and manned by university professors, as, for instance, the *Theologische Praktisches Institut* at Greifswald, and the *Prediger Seminar* at Heidelberg. All these institutions, however, fail to remedy the defect, inasmuch as but a very small proportion of the theological students of Germany ever see them. In England diocesan schools have also been erected in some places for the same purpose, as, for example, the Lampeter, St. Aidan, and St. Bees, but they constitute a scarcely appreciable element in the educational machinery of the country. As a rule, the clergy of all the Protestant State Churches are educated under the system described. As a system it is burdened with all the defects enumerated.

Having thus pointed out the excellences of the Catholic system, and set them off by contrast with the palpable shortcomings of the method pursued in the Protestant State Churches, it is now time to turn the tables, and set forth the good features of the State Church style of clerical training, as contrasted with that existing among the Catholics. And here we remark, in the first place, that *the tendency of the State Church Protestant system is to develop self-reliant men, the tendency of the Papal system, on the contrary, is to produce mere functionaries.* The liberty enjoyed by the student at a Protestant university in Europe is of course liable to abuse; but where it is not abused it is unquestionably favorable to the development of manly character. The student is made to think, and to think on his own responsibility. He makes the thousand mistakes to which an immature judgment is liable, but by these very mistakes his judgment is developed and matured. Conscious of his liberty, he is also necessarily conscious of his responsibility. Conscious of his responsibility, he is stimulated to make the most of himself. If a sober and thoughtful youth, he is almost certain to acquire a correctness of judgment and a strength of character invaluable in a man destined to occupy the responsible post of a public religious teacher. In the Catholic system all the tendencies lie in the opposite direction. The little black-robed boy-priest is brought so early under the influence of his ecclesiastical superior, kept so constantly under strict ecclesiastical surveillance, restrained so jealously from every exercise of independent thought, treated so completely like a child, that he has no chance to develôp that personal independence and self-reliance which constitute the backbone of all firm and manly character. Under such influences plastic natures become mere fac-similes of their spiritual preceptors, while the less yielding ones discover in hypocritical sycophancy a royal road to distinction. In the matter of producing *men*, therefore, the Romish system cannot compare with that in vogue in Protestant State Churches.

But again, the State Church Protestant system *confers upon the theological student a breadth of general culture to which the Romish priesthood, educated in the diocesan seminaries, can lay no claim.*

The course of instruction originally prescribed by the Coun-

Having thus pointed out the excellences of the Catholic system, and set them off by contrast with the palpable shortcomings of the method pursued in the Protestant State Churches, it is now time to turn the tables, and set forth the good features of the State Church style of clerical training, as contrasted with that existing among the Catholics. And here we remark, in the first place, that *the tendency of the State Church Protestant system is to develop self-reliant men, the tendency of the Papal system, on the contrary, is to produce mere functionaries.* The liberty enjoyed by the student at a Protestant university in Europe is of course liable to abuse; but where it is not abused it is unquestionably favorable to the development of manly character. The student is made to think, and to think on his own responsibility. He makes the thousand mistakes to which an immature judgment is liable, but by these very mistakes his judgment is developed and matured. Conscious of his liberty, he is also necessarily conscious of his responsibility. Conscious of his responsibility, he is stimulated to make the most of himself. If a sober and thoughtful youth, he is almost certain to acquire a correctness of judgment and a strength of character invaluable in a man destined to occupy the responsible post of a public religious teacher. In the Catholic system all the tendencies lie in the opposite direction. The little black-robed boy priest is brought so early under the influence of his ecclesiastical superior, kept so constantly under strict ecclesiastical surveillance, restrained so jealously from every exercise of independent thought, treated so completely like a child, that he has no chance to develop that personal independence and self-reliance which constitute the backbone of all firm and manly character. Under such influences plastic natures become mere facsimiles of their spiritual preceptors, while the less yielding ones discover in hypocritical sycophancy a royal road to distinction. In the matter of producing *men*, therefore, the Romish system cannot compare with that in vogue in Protestant State Churches.

But again, the State Church Protestant system *imposes upon the theological student a breadth of general culture to which the Romish priesthood, educated in the diocesan seminaries, can lay no claim.*

The course of instruction originally prescribed by the Council of Trent for the clerical seminary embraced only the following branches: "Grammar, Singing, the Church Calendar, and other good arts; furthermore, the Holy Scriptures, the Ecclesiastical Books, the Homilies of the Saints, Casuistical Theology, and Liturgies." Whatever the term other "good arts" may have signified in the Tridentinum, it is clear, from the history of the institution, that the bishops have never regarded it as including all the studies which Protestants call good. The standard of scholarship in these schools has of course varied at different times and in different places; but at no time, and in no place, have they conferred a broad or well-balanced education. The cultivation of classical studies has been feeble; the natural sciences have been almost utterly ignored; with general literature, poetry, art, political economy, psychology, *et cetera*, the student has gained no acquaintance. Whatever proficiency he may have shown in purely professional studies, the graduate of the Catholic clerical seminary has never shown himself a scholar in the broader and truer sense of the word. In this respect, therefore, the comparison of the two systems is decidedly favorable to the State Church Protestant one. Whatever other defects it may have, this system does certainly tend to produce men of broad and liberal culture. The very atmosphere of a European university is in this respect education. The free association enjoyed with learned professors of every conceivable science, the enthusiasm of numbers, the excitement of competition, the contacts of kindred and unkindred mind, the rivalries of professions, the discussions of public questions—all these and a thousand other nameless influences are constantly stimulating the young man, prompting to broadest acquisition, developing fullest power. The result is, the Protestant clergy have always possessed a *general culture* broader, more thorough and scientific, than the Roman Catholic.

Finally, we may safely assert, that *the specifically theological education conferred in the Protestant university is superior to that conferred in the Catholic clerical seminary.*

It is granted that the theological education conferred at Oxford and Cambridge is exceedingly defective; but take the British, German, Dutch, and Scandinavian universities as a class, and no contradiction on this head need be feared, even

from a candid and intelligent Catholic. The Romanists have profoundly learned theologians, but as a rule they do not come from the clerical seminary, but from the Catholic university. Even with these they are behind the Protestant State Churches in accuracy, comprehensiveness, and depth of theological scholarship. In all profounder questions of sacred philology, criticism, geography, ethnology, history, one must go to Protestant authors for the latest, deepest, and most philosophic researches. Catholic writers themselves have often tacitly acknowledged this. The explanation is simple. The Catholic seminary professor has been isolated from contact with the scientific world —confined to the drudgery of manufacturing a race of human automatons for the use of the Holy Catholic Church. The Protestant university professor, on the contrary, has been for generations in closest identification with the great centers where science is cultivated and thought evolved. The one has had the temptations of an easy and assured settlement, the other the stimulus of competition and good fellowship. The one has been confined to the defense of an infallibly corrupt Church, the other has been free to follow his instinctive love of truth. The one is the devotee of an institution, the other lives for his science. The result is, the one produces good mass-celebrators, the other thorough theological scholars.

These, then, are the respective excellences and defects of those educational systems which have grown up out of the Roman Catholic and State Church Protestant theories of the ministerial call. It remains to set forth in another paper the distinctively Methodistic system, and to consider the question of its adaptation to the present circumstances and wants of our Church.

ART. VI.—THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.

METHODISM, in its primitive form, in America, had many societies organized within the present limits of the Southern States prior to the Revolutionary War. Immediately after its organization as an Episcopal Church, in 1784, societies were rapidly multiplied throughout the South, and several annual from a candid and intelligent Catholic. The Romanists have profoundly learned theologians, but as a rule they do not come from the clerical seminary, but from the Catholic university. Even with these they are behind the Protestant State Churches in accuracy, comprehensiveness, and depth of theological scholarship. In all profounder questions of sacred philology, exegesis, geography, ethnology, history, one must go to Protestant authors for the latest, deepest, and most philosophic researches. Catholic writers themselves have often tacitly acknowledged this. The explanation is simple. The Catholic seminary professor has been isolated from contact with the scientific world—confined to the drudgery of manufacturing a race of human automatons for the use of the Holy Catholic Church. The Protestant university professor, on the contrary, has been for generations in closest identification with the great centers where science is cultivated and thought evolved. The one has had the temptations of an easy and assured settlement, the other the stimulus of competition and good fellowship. The one has been confined to the defense of an infallibly correct Church, the other has been free to follow his instinctive love of truth. The one is the devotee of an institution, the other lives for his science. The result is, the one produces good mass-celebrators, the other thorough theological scholars.

These, then, are the respective excellences and defects of those educational systems which have grown up out of the Roman Catholic and State Church Protestant theories of the ministerial call. It remains to set forth in another paper the distinctively Methodistic system, and to consider the question of its adaptation to the present circumstances and wants of our Church.

ART. VI.—THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.

METHODISM, in its primitive form, in America, had many societies organized within the present limits of the Southern States prior to the Revolutionary War. Immediately after its organization as an Episcopal Church, in 1784, societies were rapidly multiplied throughout the South, and several annual

Conferences were held there before the year 1790. From this date, for fifty-five years the Methodist Episcopal Church exercised unquestioned jurisdiction within all the States and Territories of the nation.

The year 1845 inaugurated a new epoch. A revolution had been precipitated upon the Church, which resulted in the organization of a new denomination, which assumed jurisdiction over nearly all the Methodist societies within the limits of the Southern States. Thereafter, the Methodist Episcopal Church was supposed to be bounded on the south by an imaginary line somewhere adjacent to "Mason and Dixon's line."

No adjustment of boundaries has ever been made between the rival organizations. An attempt to do it was unsuccessful. It has not been renewed since 1848. For more than twenty-five years the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have occupied, in common, such portions of the United States as their inclinations and opportunities allowed. The expansion of the first-named Church southward was very slow, however, until after the extirpation of slavery and the close of the civil war.

These events made freemen of millions of slaves, and also made poor men of multitudes who had been rich slaveholders. The Southern Churches generally, and most of all the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, suffered sadly from the exhaustion and impoverishment which followed the devastations of war; so that the support of their most important Churches was as much as they could at once provide for. Many of their Churches were unsupplied, and others were wholly broken up and scattered. Besides, their missionary treasury was burdened with a heavy debt, and missionary work, even to the extent to which that had been sustained before the war, was now impossible. And that work had suddenly expanded to proportions of immense magnitude.

A nation had been born in a day, whose pressing necessities, intellectual and spiritual, could only be supplied by an immediate outlay of millions of money, and the earnest labors of thousands of devoted men and women as preachers and teachers. A million of children clamored for the knowledge of letters. An equal number of adults begged for the privilege of learning to read God's word.

Conferences were held there before the year 1790. From this date, for fifty-five years the Methodist Episcopal Church exercised unquestioned jurisdiction within all the States and Territories of the nation.

The year 1845 inaugurated a new epoch. A revolution had been precipitated upon the Church, which resulted in the organization of a new denomination, which assumed jurisdiction over nearly all the Methodist societies within the limits of the Southern States. Thereafter, the Methodist Episcopal Church was supposed to be bounded on the south by an imaginary line somewhere adjacent to "Mason and Dixon's line."

No adjustment of boundaries has ever been made between the rival organizations. An attempt to do it was unsuccessful. It has not been renewed since 1848. For more than twenty-five years the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have occupied, in common, such portions of the United States as their inclinations and opportunities allowed. The expansion of the first-named Church southward was very slow, however, until after the extirpation of slavery and the close of the civil war.

These events made freemen of millions of slaves, and also made poor men of multitudes who had been rich slaveholders. The Southern Churches generally, and most of all the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, suffered sadly from the exhaustion and impoverishment which followed the devastations of war; so that the support of their most important Churches was as much as they could at once provide for. Many of their Churches were unsupplied, and others were wholly broken up and scattered. Besides, their missionary treasury was burdened with a heavy debt, and missionary work, even to the extent to which that had been organized before the war, was now impossible. And that work had suddenly expanded to proportions of immense magnitude.

A nation had been born in a day, whose pressing necessities, intellectual and spiritual, could only be supplied by an immediate outlay of millions of money, and the earnest labors of thousands of devoted men and women as preachers and teachers. A million of children clamored for the knowledge of letters. An equal number of adults begged for the privilege of learning to read God's word.

The money needed to provide school-houses, and support teachers for the freedmen, to supply pastors for destitute flocks, to build houses of worship for the poor, the South did not have. The work to be done was despised and rejected by the Southern people generally. Public sentiment fiercely antagonized it. The Freedmen's Bureau was hated without a cause, and was made "a hissing and a curse." Indigent women of the South, competent and anxious to teach, were prevented from doing so because threatened with social ostracism if they dared to teach negro children or take "Yankee pay." Thus a necessity for intervention was created by the Southern people themselves. It was promptly and amply met by the Government and the Churches of the North.

The national treasury was opened. Various denominations domiciled at the North contributed large sums of money. Hundreds of teachers and scores of ministers went South as missionaries. Small pay, hard work, constant privation, social ostracism, and frequent exposure to deadly peril, tested their sincerity and heroism, and also guaranteed their success. Among those laborers were found more members of the Methodist Church than of any other. This surely was not a fault. Nor is it claimed to be meritorious. It was rather a partial index of the greater obligation of so large a body of Christians.

The school-house, the Sunday-school, the Church, are all closely related every-where. In the South there was an immediate outgrowth from the first to the second and the third. A demand was realized in many new places for houses of worship. The wants of freedmen were greater than was the supply before furnished to slaves. The cabin worship of plantation hands was not suited to the case of "American citizens of African descent." The former sufficed when attendance on worship, and even membership in the Church, was dependent on the will of a master. But when all were at liberty to go who chose to attend, there was not room enough to contain them.

Providentially, the missionary treasury of the Methodist Episcopal Church had a surplus of funds on hand. Seventy thousand dollars were appropriated to the Southern mission field, for the purpose of building churches. Many small houses were erected, at a cost of only a few hundred dollars each. Subsequently the Church Extension Society carried for

The money needed to provide school-houses, and support teachers for the freedmen, to supply pastors for desolate flocks, to build houses of worship for the poor, the South did not have. The work to be done was despised and rejected by the Southern people generally. Public sentiment fiercely antagonized it. The Freedmen's Bureau was hated without a cause, and was made "a byword and a curse." Indigent women of the South, competent and anxious to teach, were prevented from doing so because threatened with social ostracism if they dared to teach negro children or take "Yankee pay." Thus a necessity for intervention was created by the Southern people themselves. It was promptly and amply met by the Government and the Churches of the North.

The national treasury was opened. Various denominations domiciled at the North contributed large sums of money. Hundreds of teachers and scores of ministers went South as missionaries. Small pay, hard work, constant privations, social ostracism, and frequent exposure to deadly peril, tested their sincerity and heroism, and also guaranteed their success. Among those laborers were found more members of the Methodist Church than of any other. This surely was not a fault. Nor is it claimed to be meritorious. It was rather a partial index of the greater obligations of so large a body of Christians.

The school-house, the Sunday-school, the Church, are all closely related every-where. In the South there was an immediate outgrowth from the first to the second and the third. A demand was realized in many new places for houses of worship. The wants of freedmen were greater than was the supply before furnished to slaves. The cabin worship of plantation hands was not suited to the case of "American citizens of African descent." The former sufficed when attendance on worship, and even membership in the Church, was dependent on the will of a master. But when all were at liberty to go who chose to attend, there was not room enough to contain them.

Providentially, the missionary treasury of the Methodist Episcopal Church had a surplus of funds on hand. Seventy thousand dollars were appropriated to the Southern mission field, for the purpose of building churches. Many small houses were erected, at a cost of only a few hundred dollars each. Subsequently the Church Extension Society carried the ward this particular work. And the Freedmen's Aid Society supplemented both the others by very generous and judicious appropriations for the educational work, commenced under Secretary Walden, and prosecuted more extensively by his successor, Dr. Rust. The aggregate outlay by all the benevolent societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church during six years largely exceeded one million of dollars. This vast sum of money was in great part paid for the support of hundreds of preachers and teachers, employed over an area of territory embracing hundreds of thousands of square miles. Not among freedmen only did they labor, for all classes were reached and served by them, who else had been uncared for and unsaved.

This general statement is introduced here as preliminary to two inquiries: Would it not have been criminally selfish to have withheld this aid from these needy souls? and, Would it not have been very unwise to have made careless strangers the almoners of this bounty?

Other considerations remain to be mentioned in justification of the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by organization as well as by mere agencies, in the Southern States.

Among the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, there were some whose loyalty to the Federal Government separated them from their brethren, and exposed them to persecution, and in some cases even expulsion, from that Church. There were also many members, whose separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1845 was always deemed by them an injustice, which they had waited long to have redressed. These both sought to resume their place in the communion of the Church of their choice.

Another class was found at the South, whose claims could not be overlooked. A large and increasing number of Methodists from the North resided in the South, whose business pursuits and social *status* did not interfere with their devotion to the interests of their own Church. They had been, in many instances, offensively repulsed by Southern Churches, for the friendship of Southern Churchmen in many cases was conditioned upon a surrender of conviction, conscience, and personal independence of thought and action. Refusing these conditions, this class stood out in the world, uncared for by any pastor's oversight. From each of these classes enumerward this paternal work. And the Freedman's Aid Society supplemented both the others by very generous and judicious appropriations for the educational work, commenced under Secretary Walden, and prosecuted more extensively by his successor, Dr. Rust. The aggregate outlay by all the benevolent societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church during six years largely exceeded one million of dollars. This vast sum of money was in great part paid for the support of hundreds of preachers and teachers, employed over an area of territory embracing hundreds of thousands of square miles. Not among freedmen only did they labor, for all classes were reached and served by them, who also had been uncared for and untaught.

This general statement is introduced here as preliminary to two inquiries: Would it not have been criminally selfish to have withheld this aid from those needy souls? and, Would it not have been very unwise to have made careless strangers the almoners of this bounty?

Other considerations remain to be mentioned in justification of the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by organization as well as by mere agencies, in the Southern States.

Among the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, there were some whose loyalty to the Federal Government separating them from their brethren, had exposed them to persecution, and in some cases even expulsion, from that Church. There were also many members, whose separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1845 was always deemed by them an injustice, which they had waited long to have redressed. These both sought to resume their place in the communion of the Church of their choice.

Another class was found in the South, whose claims could not be overlooked. A large and increasing number of Methodists from the North resided in the South, whose business pursuits and social status did not interfere with their devotion to the interests of their own Church. They had been, in many instances, offensively repulsed by Southern Churches, for the friendship of Southern Churchmen in many cases was conditioned upon a surrender of convictions, conscience, and personal independence of thought and action. Meeting these conditions, this class stood out in the world, unawed by any pastor's oversight. From each of these classes came ated an earnest and continued cry was heard, "Come, help us!"

The Methodist Episcopal Church heard and answered that cry. Would she not have been recreant to duty had she hesitated to consider questions of ecclesiastical etiquette, and refused to cross an imaginary border line which slavery had prescribed?

The indications of the will of God, by the providential openings afforded, were almost as plainly expressed as when the Spirit said to Peter, "Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them." And the results following are even more demonstrative in proof of this than the antecedent facts seemed to be peremptory in their demands for aid.

These statements furnish an answer to the inquiry, Why did the Methodist Episcopal Church enter and re-occupy the South? The narrative following will show what she has done for the South in six years, and at what cost. It will aim to answer fully other inquiries, such as, Should that Church now withdraw from the Southern field? or, Should she not occupy it, and extend her operations commensurate with her opportunity, ability, and obligations?

I. THE NEW WORK—EXTENT AND GROWTH.

The territory added to the area of the Methodist Episcopal Church by the re-occupation of the South exceeds eight hundred thousand square miles. The increase of population to which she has access is almost eight millions of souls. From this territory and population that Church was shut out for twenty years. Since 1864 this extensive field has been traversed yearly by her Bishops, organized, and supplied with men and means. The Annual Conferences formed, and the time and place of their first sessions, are given below.

1.	Holston	Athens, Tenn.	June 1, 1865.
2.	Mississippi	New Orleans, La.	Dec. 25–27, 1865.
3.	S. Carolina	Charleston, S. C.	April 23, 1866.
4.	Tennessee	Murfreesborough, Tenn.	Oct. 11–14, 1866.
5.	Texas	Houston, Texas	Jan. 3–5, 1867.
6.	Virginia	Portsmouth, Va.	Jan. 3–7, 1867.
7.	Georgia	Atlanta, Geo	Oct. 10–14, 1867.
8.	Alabama	Talladega, Ala.	Oct. 17–20, 1867.
9.	Louisiana	New Orleans, La.	Jan. 13–18, 1869.
10.	N. Carolina	Union Chapel, N. C.	Jan. 14–18, 1869.

The ministerial supply for these Conferences was furnished largely from within their own limits. A few chaplains remained after the Union army was withdrawn. Veteran preachers among the late slaves were prompt to offer their welcome services. In two or three States ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were received. These all were supplemented by worthy men who were transferred from the older Conferences to direct and control the missionary work and the reconstruction of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States.· These last numbered in all about fifty, who came from all sections of the Union, so that a very small draft was made upon the Church to supply the new work.

The Holston Conference began with about twenty ministerial members. The Mississippi Conference, then including the germs of the Louisiana and Texas Conferences, was organized with five members. The South Carolina Conference began with five. The Tennessee Conference commenced with less than twenty. Five more ministers were put down for the mission districts of Alabama and Georgia. With this force, and seventy-five preachers on trial, these Conferences commenced their first year's history.

The General Minutes for 1866 contained the following statistics: Mississippi, 2,216; Holston, 13,918; South Carolina, 2,791; Tennessee, 2,689; the Mission Districts of Alabama and Georgia, 4,000. Total, 25,614, exclusive of probationers.

Six years of labor produced an abundant increase. The one hundred and thirty traveling preachers had increased over four hundred per cent., numbering in 1871 six hundred and thirty; and the twenty-five thousand members had increased four hundred and thirty per cent., showing a total of one hundred and thirty-five thousand four hundred and twenty-four.

Of the traveling preachers two hundred and sixty are white, and three hundred and seventy are of African descent. The membership includes forty-seven thousand white people, and eighty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty-five of all other persons.

The number of white members is quoted from the statistical report of the Athens Convention of 1871. The number of white preachers is obtained from information furnished by secretaries of the respective Conferences, or others who know.

The ministerial supply for these Conferences was furnished largely from within their own limits. A few chaplains remained after the Union army was withdrawn. Veteran preachers among the late slaves were prompt to offer their welcome services. In two or three States ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were received. These all were supplemented by worthy men who were transferred from the older Conferences to direct and control the missionary work and the reconstruction of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States. These last numbered in all about fifty, who came from all sections of the Union, so that a very small draft was made upon the Church to supply the new work.

The Holston Conference began with about twenty ministerial members. The Mississippi Conference, then including the germs of the Louisiana and Texas Conferences, was organized with five members. The South Carolina Conference began with five. The Tennessee Conference commenced with less than twenty. Five more ministers were put down for the Mission districts of Alabama and Georgia. With this force, and seventy-five preachers on trial, these Conferences commenced their first year's history.

The General Minutes for 1866 furnished the following statistics: Mississippi, 2,310; Holston, 13,413; South Carolina, 2,791; Tennessee, 2,080; the Mission Districts of Alabama and Georgia, 4,680. Total, 25,274, exclusive of probationers.

Six years of labor produced an abundant increase. The one hundred and thirty traveling preachers had increased over four hundred per cent., numbering in 1871 six hundred and thirty; and the twenty-five thousand members had increased four hundred and thirty per cent., showing a total of one hundred and thirty-five thousand four hundred and twenty-four.

Of the traveling preachers two hundred and sixty are white, and three hundred and seventy are of African descent. The membership includes forty-seven thousand white people, and eighty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty-five of all other persons.

The number of white members is quoted from the statistical report of the Athens Convention of 1871. The number of white preachers is obtained from information furnished by secretaries of the respective Conferences, or others who know

The general statistics hereafter given will be from the latest reports available. The General Minutes for 1871 was not published when this paper was written.

II. THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

The most serious objections made to the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States are heard from persons at the North. Southern people who know the facts never mention them now.

It is said that the large numbers reported as above are gathered by tearing down the societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. But what are the facts? An answer is found in the statistics of that Church.

Their General Minutes for 1860 reported for twenty-four Conferences 626,060 members, including 171,857 "colored." Five years later, and before the organization of the first southern mission conference by the Methodist Episcopal Church, the General Minutes of the Church South report only fourteen Conferences. These in 1860 had reported 513,790, including 150,860 "colored." In 1865 they stand thus: Whole membership, 393,799, of which 81,169 are "colored." Thus giving a decrease of 50,300 white and 69,690 colored members for the previous five years, or from 1860 to 1865.

Of the ten other Conferences it may be fairly assumed that their decrease was not proportionately less, as their disturbed condition prevented some of them from meeting, and none of them reported their statistics for the year 1865. A diminution of one fifth of their entire membership is a moderate calculation, and easily demonstrable from their statistics, as officially recognized at the close of the war, and before the Methodist Episcopal Church had organized within the disputed territory.

Five years afterward the General Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for 1870, report for these same fourteen Conferences a white membership of 361,593, an increase in five years of 48,963. Whether these were gathered in from the world, or were saved from fragments of societies scattered abroad during the war, the fact is demonstrated that the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church in their midst did

The general statistics hereafter given will be from the latest reports available. The General Minutes for 1871 was not published when this paper was written.

II. THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

The most serious objections made to the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States are urged from persons at the North. Southern people who know the facts never mention them now.

It is said that the large numbers reported as above are gathered by tearing down the societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. But what are the facts? An answer is found in the statistics of that Church.

Their General Minutes for 1860 reported for twenty-four Conferences 598,060 members, including 171,857 "colored." Five years later, and before the organization of the first southern mission conference by the Methodist Episcopal Church, the General Minutes of the Church South report only fourteen Conferences. These in 1860 had reported 513,765, including 150,869 "colored." In 1865 they stand thus: Whole membership, 398,790, of which 51,149 are "colored." Thus giving a decrease of 20,580 white and 99,720 colored members for the previous five years, or from 1860 to 1865.

Of the ten other Conferences it may be fairly assumed that their decrease was not proportionately less, as their disturbed condition prevented some of them from meeting, and some of them reported their statistics for the year 1865. A diminution of one fifth of their entire membership is a moderate calculation, and easily demonstrable from their statistics, as officially recognized at the close of the war, and before the Methodist Episcopal Church had organized within the disputed territory.

Five years afterward the General Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for 1870, report for these same fourteen Conferences a white membership of 391,838, an increase in five years of 43,893. Whether these were gathered in from the world, or were saved from fragments of societies scattered abroad during the war, the fact is demonstrated that the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church in their midst did not prevent an accumulation of strength and numbers nearly equal in measure and quantity to that claimed at the period of their highest prosperity.

The entire statistics of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for 1860 and 1870 show more fully the same fact. These periods are indicated below by the double groups of figures following each class named.

Conferences, 24, 34; Bishops, 6, 10; ministers, 2,778, 2,912; white members, 454,203, 561,571. The colored membership cannot now form any part of comparative statistics for two reasons. In 1866 an unofficial yet very general consent was given by this Church for their colored membership to join the "African Methodist Episcopal Church." Houses of worship were allowed to pass into their hands, yet without legal transfer of title. And over one hundred thousand are claimed by the "African" Church to have been added to them thereby. After this a new line of policy was adopted, and in 1870 the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, provided for the organization of the "Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America," which has now two Bishops and numerous Annual Conferences, claiming a communion of over one hundred thousand souls. The entire number of that class in the Methodist Episcopal Church is less than ninety thousand.

If, therefore, any purpose was contemplated to damage and tear down the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that purpose has been signally defeated. If that Church feared any such result, that expectation has been agreeably disappointed. For here in plain figures are the unmistakable evidences of strength and prosperity to encourage its friends and to silence the disheartening prophecies of its foes.

A few thousands of the white members of that Church have chosen a more congenial home in the Methodist Episcopal Church. But their number has been made up fully by the thousands who went in an opposite direction, and now largely constitute the membership of the Baltimore and Illinois Conferences of the "Church South." Besides, in all the large Southern cities numerous members of the Methodist Episcopal Church are going yearly to reside, whose dominant purpose being to buy, and sell, and get gain, dare not join their own

Church. These become the adherents of that Church which can afford them the protection of Southern influence, and secure Southern trade.

The figures and facts thus furnished indicate that a healthy rivalry has sprung up, promotive of success, which may ultimately secure co-operative union between the two Methodisms throughout the entire continent and world.

III. OUTLAY, LABOR, FRUIT.

Assuming, with entire confidence, that the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States has secured its present numerous ministry and membership by means every way legitimate, there remain two questions of importance to be considered and answered. What has it cost? And, also, Has the outlay been more or less productive than other missionary appropriations?

The expenditures for six years past within the ten Annual Conferences named already sum up as follows: Missionary Society, $780,973; Church Extension Society, $70,040; Freedmen's Aid Society, $271,538; Sunday-School Union, $11,890; Tract Society, $6,000. Total, $1,140,441.

Of this sum three fifths was expended in supporting preachers of the word of life. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars were invested in land and buildings for schools by the Freedmen's Aid Society. One hundred and forty thousand dollars were laid out for building houses of worship. One hundred thousand dollars were paid for the support of teachers, mainly under Dr. Rust's direction. The balance, or about forty thousand dollars, was paid out for papers, tracts, and books. Of this amount twenty-five thousand dollars were expended for the schools above-named. And only fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars were distributed among nearly one thousand Sunday-schools, during a period of six years, an average to each of two dollars and fifty cents annually. This summary is obtained by a careful examination of official statements up to October, 1851.

A practical, business-like view of the facts involved can be best presented by a few direct questions, with a full and frank answer to each.

Church. These became the adherents of that Church which can afford them the protection of Southern influence, and secure Southern trade.

The figures and facts thus furnished indicate that a healthy rivalry has sprung up, preventive of success, which may ultimately secure co-operative union between the two Methodisms throughout the entire continent and world.

III. Outlay, Labors, Fruit.

Assuming, with entire confidence, that the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States has secured its present numerous ministry and membership by means every way legitimate, there remain two questions of importance to be considered and answered. What has it cost? And also, Has the outlay been more or less productive than other missionary appropriations?

The expenditures for six years past within the ten Annual Conferences named already sum up as follows: Missionary Society, $780,073; Church Extension Society, $170,000; Freedmen's Aid Society, $271,548; Sunday-School Union, $11,890; Tract Society, $6,000. Total, $1,127,441.

Of this sum three fifths was expended in supporting preachers of the word of life. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars were invested in land and buildings for schools by the Freedmen's Aid Society. One hundred and forty thousand dollars were laid out for building houses of worship. One hundred thousand dollars were paid for the support of teachers, mainly under Dr. Rust's direction. The balance, or about forty thousand dollars, was paid out for papers, tracts, and books. Of this amount twenty-five thousand dollars were expended for the schools above-named. And only fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars were distributed among nearly one thousand Sunday-schools, during a period of six years, an average to each of two dollars and fifty cents annually. This summary is obtained by a careful examination of official statements up to October, 1851.

A practical, business-like view of the facts involved can be best presented by a few direct questions, with a full and frank answer to each.

1. What amount of ministerial work has been performed in return for the $710,000 of missionary money expended?

The amount of labor performed by all the preachers in ten conferences within six years furnishes the answer required. For whatever additional amount for ministerial support has been raised among the people was all the product of the missionary outlay.

The first year one hundred and thirty preachers were employed; the second year three hundred and ten; the third, three hundred and ninety-one; the fourth, four hundred and seventy-five; the fifth, five hundred and forty-five; and the sixth, six hundred and thirty. Each unit of these numbers represents one year of ministerial labor. The sum of them is two thousand four hundred and eighty-one. This, divided into $710,000, gives an average cost to the missionary fund for each preacher of $286 17½ per annum. The labor performed is, in other words, that of four hundred and thirteen preachers for six successive years.

Surely there were no lucrative salaries expended on inefficient men, but rather a generous appropriation, most economically disbursed, in aid of a large number of missionary presiding elders, pastors, and preachers, the extent of whose labors, and the rich fruit following, must command the admiration and continued patronage of the Church, while it may well challenge comparison with any department of the missionary field.

2. What amount of educational work has been done for the $100,000 laid out by the Freedmen's Aid Society?

The first establishment of educational institutions by that Society was in 1866. Five full years have been occupied in this department. An average of ninety teachers has been employed yearly for five years. One hundred thousand of dollars distributed among them would be an average of two hundred and twenty-two dollars a year, or eighteen dollars and one half per month. Was ever so small a sum of money productive of so large an amount of labor? The names of these missionary educators constitute a roll of honor of which the Church may well be proud. Verily, they have not here their reward. But for the information of the Church a list of all their names should be appropriately given in the annual

1. What amount of ministerial work has been performed in return for the $710,000 of missionary money expended?

The amount of labor performed by all the preachers in ten conferences within six years furnishes the answer required. For whatever additional amount for ministerial support has been raised among the people was all the product of the missionary outlay.

The first year one hundred and thirty preachers were employed; the second year three hundred and ten; the third, three hundred and ninety-one; the fourth, four hundred and seventy-five; the fifth, five hundred and forty-five; and the sixth, six hundred and thirty. Each unit of these numbers represents one year of ministerial labor. The sum of them is two thousand four hundred and eighty-one. This divided into $710,000, gives an average cost to the missionary fund for each preacher of $286 17½ per annum. The labor performed is, in other words, that of four hundred and thirteen preachers for six successive years.

Surely there were no lucrative salaries expended on inefficient men, but rather a generous appropriation, most economically disbursed, in aid of a large number of missionary presiding elders, pastors, and preachers, the extent of whose labors, and the rich fruit following, must command the admiration and continued patronage of the Church, while it may well challenge comparison with any department of the missionary field.

2. What amount of educational work has been done for the $100,000 laid out by the Freedmen's Aid Society?

The first establishment of educational institutions by that Society was in 1866. Five full years have been occupied in this department. An average of ninety teachers has been employed yearly for five years. One hundred thousand of dollars distributed among them would be an average of two hundred and twenty-two dollars a year, or eighteen dollars and one half per month. Was ever so small a sum of money productive of so large an amount of labor? The names of these missionary educators constitute a roll of honor of which the Church may well be proud. Verily, they have not lost their reward. But for the information of the Church a list of all their names should be appropriately given in the annual reports of the Freedmen's Aid Society. It is an element of Church history that cannot be well dispensed with.

3. What have the ten Conferences to show for the $140,000 laid out to buy and build houses of worship at the South?

Facts as well as figures constitute the answer to this question. The appropriations were made by hundreds of dollars more frequently than by thousands. In many instances, one hundred dollars in money often secured twice that amount in lumber and as much more in labor; so that at the very first Conferences following such appropriations they would report church property of fivefold the money value expended. This explains, in part, the wodderful increase in the value of church property that will appear. Besides, the Government gave frequently two, and five hundred dollars in single instances, to aid in erecting houses, on condition that they might be used for Bureau Schools.

All these contributions by the people and gifts from the General Government were caused by the appropriations of the Church. The aggregate value tells what there is to show for the $140,000.

Before presenting a statement respecting the ten Conferences the statistics of one will be of special interest taken alone. The Louisiana Conference had appropriated to it from the Church Extension Society, for 1869–70, the sum of $4,600. During the year 1870 alone, the Churches of that Conference raised by contributions $11,500 for church building, and more than that sum for their pastors and presiding elders.

Again, the total value of church property reported by that Conference for 1870 was $180,930. Deduct from this the value of three houses in New Orleans not claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, but held by local trustees under military orders Nos. 32 and 119 for 1865, issued from head-quarters February 6 and November 18, and there then remains a balance of nearly $140,000, or a sum equal to the whole amount expended by the Church within the limits of ten Annual Conferences during a period of six years ending 1870.

Finally, the church property within the limits of the nine other Conferences—Alabama, Georgia, Holston, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, and Virginia, is reported as more than $750,000. And this vast sum reports of the Freedmen's Aid Society. It is an element of Church history that cannot be well dispensed with.

2. What have the ten Conferences to show for the $140,000 laid out to buy and build houses of worship at the South?

Facts as well as figures constitute the answer to this question. The appropriations were made by hundreds of dollars more frequently than by thousands. In many instances, one hundred dollars in money often secured twice that amount in lumber and as much more in labor; so that at the very first Conferences following such appropriations they would report church property of fivefold the money value expended. This explains, in part, the wonderful increase in the value of church property that will appear. Besides, the Government gave frequently two, and five hundred dollars in single instances, to aid in erecting houses, on condition that they might be used for Bureau Schools.

All these contributions by the people and gifts from the General Government were caused by the appropriations of the Church. The aggregate value tells what there is to show for the $140,000.

Before presenting a statement respecting the ten Conferences the statistics of one will be of special interest upon alone. The Louisiana Conference had appropriated to it from the Church Extension Society, for 1865-70, the sum of $4,000. During the year 1870 alone, the Churches of that Conference raised by contributions $11,500 for church building, and more than that sum for their pastors and presiding elders.

Again, the total value of church property reported by that Conference for 1870 was $180,950. Deduct from this the value of three houses in New Orleans not claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, but held by local trustees under military orders Nos. 39 and 119 for 1866, issued from head-quarters February 6 and November 15, and there then remains a balance of nearly $140,000, or a sum equal to the whole amount expended by the Church within the limits of ten Annual Conferences during a period of six years ending 1870.

Finally, the church property within the limits of the nine other Conferences—Alabama, Georgia, Holston, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, and Virginia, is reported as more than $250,000. And this vast sum is the net profit on an investment of less than one fifth that sum, which has, however, realized during six years of comparative peace and prosperity the increased value common to all southern property.

4. What is the present value of the real estate owned and occupied by the literary institutions within these Conferences, upon which the Freedmen's Aid Society has expended $150,000?

The answer to this question is furnished by a special report made to the writer by Dr. Rust. The amount of property in each of the Conferences is stated thus:

Alabama, $10,000; Georgia, $14,000; Mississippi, $15,000; Louisiana, $42,000; Virginia, $25,000; South Carolina, $17,000; Tennessee, $40,000; Holston, $3,000 — Total, $166,000.

In the "3d" answer of this statement it is assumed that the "ten Conferences" received the entire seventy thousand dollars given by the Missionary Society for building churches at the South. As a portion of that sum was appropriated to other Conferences at the South, a margin is left to offset any appropriations possibly omitted in the statement herein given. And therefore the substantial accuracy of the exhibit will be guaranteed, so far as the general footing of the figures is concerned. It is proper here also to say, that as the Lexington Conference was organized within the limits of the Kentucky Conference, on territory that was occupied long before the war, it is not included in this paper. From 1865 onward is the period under consideration Territory entered and occupied since then only is included.

IV. BENEVOLENT COLLECTIONS.

This exhibit needs one other feature to be complete. That will be given in answer to the following inquiry: Have the recipients of this generous expenditure of money made any returns to the general fund of the Church? or have they been selfishly absorbing the revenues that others have supplied?

The collection for Conference claimants and for the American Bible Society are not estimated, because these do not reach the denominational treasury. The contributions to the Freedmen's Aid Society are also omitted, because only recently is the net profit on an investment of less than one fifth that sum, which has, however, realized during six years of comparative peace and prosperity the increased value common to all southern property.

4. What is the present value of the real estate owned and occupied by the literary institutions within these Conferences, upon which the Freedmen's Aid Society has expended $150,000?

The answer to this question is furnished by a special report made to the writer by Dr. Rust. The amount of property in each of the Conferences is stated thus:

Alabama, $10,000; Georgia, $14,000; Mississippi, $15,000; Louisiana, $42,000; Virginia, $25,000; South Carolina, $17,000; Tennessee, $40,000; Holston, $8,000. Total, $164,000.

In the "3d" answer of this statement it is assumed that the "ten Conferences" received the entire seventy thousand dollars given by the Missionary Society for building churches at the South. As a portion of that sum was appropriated to other Conferences at the South, a margin is left to offset any appropriations possibly omitted in the statement herein given. And therefore the substantial accuracy of the exhibit will be guaranteed, so far as the general footing of the figures is concerned. It is proper here also to say, that as the Lexington Conference was organized within the limits of the Kentucky Conference, on territory that was occupied long before the war, it is not included in this paper. From 1865 onward is the period under consideration. Territory entered and occupied since then only is included.

IV. Benevolent Collections.

This exhibit needs one other feature to be complete. That will be given in answer to the following inquiry: Have the recipients of this generous expenditure of money made any returns to the general fund of the Church? or have they been selfishly absorbing the revenues that others have supplied?

The collection for Conference claimants and for the American Bible Society are not estimated, because these do not reach the denominational treasury. The contributions to the Freedmen's Aid Society are also omitted, because only recently made one of the regular collections. But the collections within the Conferences, during the six years since 1865, for the Missionary and Church Extension Societies, Sunday-School Union and Tract Societies are included in the following summary:

The Freedmen, as reported by Dr. Rust, have contributed for tuition and board to the funds of the Aid Society in five years, $25,000. The loans returned to the Church Extension Society amounted to $1,500 prior to 1870.

The total of all the collections from 1866 to 1871 for the four societies above named is $44,300. This last sum is only an average of about $723 for each Conference. But the grand total of money returned to the Church fund is the very considerable sum of $69,900.

Leaving out the $25,000 just named, the balance ($4,490) is greatly in excess of any thing ever received for missionary Conferences during the first six years of their history, in the home or foreign field now occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church or any other denomination of Christians.

Besides, the net increase of value of church property ($750,000) is $40,000 more than the missionary outlay. And that forty thousand dollars offsets the total outlay of the Freedmen's Aid Society, Sunday-School Union, and Tract Society, for books, tracts, and papers for the literary institutions and Sunday-schools of ten Conferences.

The financial exhibit may be put into a sentence: The cash outlay is more than offset by the property assets, leaving more than one hundred and thirty-five thousand souls in Church membership, with nearly one hundred thousand children in Sunday-school, under the care of five hundred pastors, raised up with the work, as the net gain on six years' labor.

V. OTHER MISSIONARY WORK.

Any comparison between these late "Mission Conferences" and the Foreign Work becomes a contrast of remarkable features. Not to the disparagement of the noble foreign missionary field, the peculiarities of and embarrassments of which are duly appreciated, but most certainly in vindication of the former, and in demonstrating its claims on the confidence and made one of the regular collections. But the collections within the Conferences, during the six years since 1866, for the Missionary and Church Extension Societies, Sunday-School Union and Tract Societies are included in the following summary:

The Freedmen, as reported by Dr. Rust, have contributed for tuition and board to the funds of the Aid Society in five years, $28,000. The loans returned to the Church Extension Society amounted to $1,500 prior to 1872.

The total of all the collections from 1866 to 1871 for the four societies above named is $43,570. This last sum is only an average of about $728 for each Conference. But the grand total of money returned to the Church fund is the very considerable sum of $68,000.

Leaving out the $28,000 just named, the balance ($43,190) is greatly in excess of any thing ever received for missionary Conferences during the first six years of their history, in the home or foreign field now occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church or any other denomination of Christians.

Besides, the net increase of value of church property ($130,000) is $40,000 more than the missionary outlay. And that forty thousand dollars offsets the total outlay of the Freedmen's Aid Society, Sunday-School Union, and Tract Society, for books, tracts, and papers for the literary institutions and Sunday-schools of ten Conferences.

The financial exhibit may be put into a sentence: The cash outlay is more than offset by the property assets, leaving more than one hundred and thirty-five thousand souls in Church membership, with nearly one hundred thousand children in Sunday-school, under the care of five hundred pastors, raised up with the *work*, as the net gain on six years' labor.

V. Other Missionary Work.

Any comparison between these late "Mission Conferences" and the Foreign Work becomes a contrast of remarkable features. Not to the disparagement of the noble foreign missionary field, the peculiarities of and embarrassments of which are duly appreciated, but most certainly in vindication of the former, and in demonstrating its claims on the world-wide patronage of the Church even in larger measures than have yet been bestowed upon it.

For a long series of years the foreign missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church have been liberally sustained. More than four millions of dollars have been carefully expended. Twice as many ministers have been taken from the old home Conferences for that field than have been transferred to the South. And what have been the results in members added, property secured, and revenue returned?

The latest statistics give the membership thus: Liberia, 1,768; South America, 143; China, 931; Germany and Switzerland, 5,812; Denmark, 219; Sweden, 1,326; Norway, 656; India, 468—Total, 11,323.

The value of church property—total, $482,332. Contributions to benevolent objects—total, $86,536. Of this last sum, India reports eighty-one thousand five hundred and seventy-two dollars, which includes large "grants of aid" for schools, by the Indian Government. Germany and Switzerland send four thousand nine hundred and fifty-four dollars. Liberia reports ten dollars. To the other missions no amount is credited. The aggregate value of church property and revenue for six years past is $568,868. Allowing the utmost margin for the amount of all their collections prior to 1866, three quarters of a million would cover the sum total.

But during the twenty years prior to 1870 the foreign missions have cost the Church over three millions of dollars. During the years 1866–1871, the disbursements by the Missionary Society for that field amount to $1,319,399. This is nearly twice as much as was expended in the "ten Southern Conferences" during the first six years of their existence, where there are three times as many ministers to support, and more than ten times as many Church members to supply with the word of life, most of whom were recently in almost a state of pagan ignorance respecting the letter of divine truth.

It is agreed by all that the necessities and the embarrassments of the foreign field demand this measure of support, and more if it could be obtained. But shall that liberality which necessity and embarrassment commands be withheld from the South, where the largest successes and the grandest opportunities invite and encourage missionary labors?

patronage of the Church even in larger measures than have yet been bestowed upon it.

For a long series of years the foreign missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church have been liberally sustained. More than four millions of dollars have been carefully expended. Twice as many ministers have been taken from the old home Conferences for that field than have been transferred to the South. And what have been the results in members added, property secured, and revenue returned?

The latest statistics give the membership thus: Liberia, 1,765; South America, 149; China, 551; Germany and Switzerland, 6,519; Denmark, 210; Sweden, 1,236; Norway, 650; India, 465—Total, 11,593.

The value of church property—total, $452,332. Contributions to benevolent objects—total, $96,533. Of this last sum, India reports eighty-one thousand five hundred and seventy-two dollars, which includes large "grants of aid" for schools, by the Indian Government. Germany and Switzerland send four thousand nine hundred and fifty-four dollars. Liberia reports ten dollars. To the other missions no amount is credited. The aggregate value of church property and revenue for six years past is $565,868. Allowing the utmost margin for the amount of all their collections prior to 1866, three quarters of a million would cover the sum total.

But during the twenty years prior to 1872 the foreign missions have cost the Church over three millions of dollars. During the years 1860-1871, the disbursements by the Missionary Society for that field amount to $1,319,590. This is nearly twice as much as was expended in the "ten Southern Conferences" during the first six years of their existence, where there are three times as many ministers to support, and more than ten times as many Church members to supply with the word of life, most of whom were recently in almost a state of pagan ignorance respecting the letter of divine truth.

It is agreed by all that the necessities and the embarrassments of the foreign field demand this measure of support, and more if it could be obtained. But shall that liberality which necessity and embarrassment commands be withheld from the South, where the largest successes and the grandest opportunities invite and encourage missionary labors?

VI. BORDER CONFERENCES—ENLARGEMENT.

The result immediately reached, as given in previous details, are yet more significant and valuable when summed up and joined with other results following indirectly in their train.

The Conferences under notice particularly do not comprise the whole of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States. For from the beginning, and without interruption by the untoward events of 1844, '45, that Church has had several Annual Conferences occupying the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, known as the "Border Conferences." They extended to the then recognized limits which slavery indicated as the southern boundary of that Church.

Being then on the frontier of disputed territory, and bearing the brunt of Southern antagonism, these Conferences did well to hold their own, and gain a small per centage yearly. But it was a constant warfare, in which many of the preachers had to "endure hardness, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ." Not figuratively, but literally could they say, "In perils by mine own countrymen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often." Even life itself was periled and lost in that field.

But when the forward movement of the Methodist army was made, which literally carried the missionary army "into Africa," the old "Border men" were relieved of the duty of mounting guard daily in the face of the foe. The men of the Mission Conferences held that line, now advanced, yet with increased burdens and perils, and at once, the "Border" Conferences expanded, advancing rapidly in numbers, power, and wealth.

Their improvement of opportunities and condition, afforded partly by the presence and influence of the pioneer forces that moved southward from Virginia to Florida, and from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico, was wonderful, and it is not an unwarrantable assumption to say, that if the late "Mission Conferences" were not where they are, the late "Border Conferences" would not be what they are in numbers and power for good. If, however, all this theorizing is set aside as mere

VI. Border Conferences—Enlargement.

The result immediately reached, as given in previous details, are yet more significant and valuable when summed up and joined with other results following indirectly in their train.

The Conferences under notice particularly do not embrace the whole of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States. For from the beginning, and without interruption by the untoward events of 1844-'45, that Church has had several Annual Conferences occupying the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, known as the "Border Conferences." They extended to the then recognized limits which slavery indicated as the southern boundary of that Church.

Being then on the frontier of disputed territory, and bearing the brunt of Southern antagonism, these Conferences did well to hold their own, and gain a small per centage yearly. But it was a constant warfare, in which many of the preachers had to "endure hardness, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ." Not figuratively, but literally, could they say, "In perils by mine own countrymen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often." Even life itself was periled and lost in that field.

But when the forward movement of the Methodist army was made, which literally carried the missionary army "into Africa," the old "Border men" were relieved of the duty of mounting guard daily in the face of the foe. The men of the Mission Conferences held that line, now advanced, yet with increased hardships and perils, and at once, the "Border" Conferences expanded, advancing rapidly in numbers, power, and wealth.

Their improvement of opportunities and condition, afforded partly by the presence and influence of the pioneer force that moved southward from Virginia to Florida, and from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico, was wonderful, and it is not an unwarrantable assumption to say, that if the late "Mission Conferences" were not where they are, the late "Border Conferences" would not be what they are in numbers and power for good. If, however, all this theorizing is set aside as mere speculation, the grand facts remain, which all will agree are sufficient grounds for congratulation and thanksgiving.

The following table of statistics exhibits the strength of the "Border Conferences" in 1865, when the Southern mission work was organized, and gives the increase after five years' labor under the more favorable auspices of freedom and peace. The statistics are limited to the actual number of members, Sunday-school children, property, and benevolent collections, omiting those for Conference claimants and Bible Society.

Baltimore and East Baltimore, that is, the Maryland part of both, are joined in 1870. Philadelphia, in part only taken in 1866, is found in Wilmington. Missouri and Arkansas are found in Missouri and St. Louis, and Kentucky is found in Kentucky and Lexington Conferences:

1866.	Members.	Scholars.	Church Property.	Collections.
Baltimore	12,037	12,428	$675,200	$18,384
Delaware	7,501	4,332	85,653	594
East Baltimore	9,444	11,040	443,500	9,390
Kentucky	5,795	3,031	76,450	659
Missouri and Arkansas	9,638	8,189	278,975	3,318
*Philadelphia	17,876	18,604	638,900	12,576
West Virginia	14,164	11,610	232,255	4,049
Washington	11,349	5,551	149,760	284
Total	87,804	74,785	$2,580,693	$49,254
1870-71.				
Baltimore	26,935	30,217	$2,251,200	$35,765
Delaware	10,017	5,454	154,675	500
Kentucky	14,721	8,258	366,750	1,993
Lexington	4,813	1,515	72,600	164
Missouri	13,244	10,661	270,260	2,017
St. Louis	14,447	10,563	404,313	3,390
West Virginia	22,965	18,871	447,200	3,369
*Wilmington	21,217	22,771	1,069,611	7,441
Washington	21,450	10,663	373,833	1,324
Total	149,809	118,973	$5,410,442	$55,963
" in 1866	87,804	74,785	2,580,693	49,254
Increase	62,005	44,188	$2,829,749	$6,709

The congeniality of the South, and the capability of its soil, morally, for the production and development of societies in connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, is placed beyond all question by these statistics. The increase in membership since 1866 gives a per centage by States as follows:

Delaware, 20 per cent.; Maryland, 25 per cent.; Virginia, 64 per cent.; Kentucky, 232 per cent.; Missouri and Arkansas, nearly 200 per cent.; while the Delaware and Washington Conferences respectively gain 33 and 90 per cent. Finally, the astonishing increase in the value of church property, from two and half millions of dollars to nearly five and a half millions, is a sufficient reason for the small increase in the sum of their benevolent collections.

The conclusion naturally following this series of statements can only be an inevitable and universal conviction that the re-occupancy of the Southern States by the Methodist Episcopal Church has been an advantage to it "much every way." The nineteen Conferences now organized, are not remote colonies, burdening and embarrassing the present body, but integral members of the one grand Church, already adding largely to her material wealth, and even now taking their places promptly with the other Conferences as sources of revenue for benevolent objects generally.

VII. THE NINETEEN SOUTHERN CONFERENCES.

There are now recognized in our General Minutes seventy-two Annual Conferences. More than one fourth of these are Southern Conferences. Their relation to the whole Methodist Episcopal Church, numerically and substantially, has not been fully realized. It may be partially understood by grouping their traveling preachers, membership, property values, and prospective representation in one statistical table.

Henceforth they are one in interest as well as locality. Being within the territory occupied in common by the two Methodisms, the surroundings of these nineteen Conferences differ essentially from those of all others.

How to adjust their movements so as best to meet peculiar antagonisms, overcome southern sectional jealousies, and harmonize discordant forces in the direction of ultimate Methodist unity, constitute so many difficult problems, which they especially, if not exclusively, are called upon to solve. And being thus one in their local surroundings, denominational interests, and future destiny, their natural tendency will probably be to unite in counsel and combine in action. Not, however, to the

Delaware, 30 per cent.; Maryland, 35 per cent.; Virginia, 64 per cent.; Kentucky, 133 per cent.; Missouri and Arkansas, nearly 200 per cent.; while the Holston and Washington Conferences respectively gain 25 and 30 per cent. Finally, the astonishing increase in the value of church property, from two and half millions of dollars to nearly five and a half millions, is a sufficient reason for the small increase in the sum of their benevolent collections.

The conclusion naturally following this series of statements can only be an inevitable and universal conviction that the reoccupancy of the Southern States by the Methodist Episcopal Church has been an advantage to it "much every way." The nineteen Conferences now organized, are not remote colonies, burdening and embarrassing the parent body, but integral members of the one grand Church, already adding largely to her material wealth, and even now taking their places promptly with the other Conferences as sources of revenue for benevolent objects generally.

VII. The Nineteen Southern Conferences.

There are now recognized in our General Minutes seventy-two Annual Conferences. More than one fourth of these are Southern Conferences. Their relation to the whole Methodist Episcopal Church, numerically and substantially, has not been fully realized. It may be partially understood by grouping their travelling preachers, membership, property values, and prospective representation in one statistical table.

Henceforth they are one in interest as well as locality. Being within the territory occupied in common by the two Methodisms, the surroundings of these nineteen Conferences differ essentially from those of all others.

How to adjust their movements so as best to meet peculiar antagonisms, overcome southern sectional jealousies, and harmonize the discordant forces in the direction of ultimate Methodist unity, constitute so many difficult problems, which they especially, if not exclusively, are called upon to solve. And being thus one in their local surroundings, denominational interests, and future destiny, their natural tendency will probably be to unite in counsel and combine in action. Not, however, extent of an offensive sectionalism, but only after the manner in which other groups of Conferences combine for the promotion of neighborhood interests.

Hereafter there is a South as well as a North, an East, a West, and a "great North-west" in the realm of American Methodism. To ignore these geographical outlines is the merest affectation of an impossible generalization of interest, and a special attention to local Conference demands is in no way obnoxious to the most catholic devotion to the Church. Observe now the peculiar facts of the following table of partial statistics:

	Members.	Property.	Trav. Preach.	M. Del.	L. Del.
1. Alabama	*13,500	*$30,000	60	1	1
2. Baltimore	26,935	2,251,200	187	6	2
3. Delaware..........	10,017	154,675	48	1	1
4. Georgia	*17,000	*60,000	70	2	2
5. Holston	20,798	151,970	86	3	2
6. Kentucky	14,721	366,750	94	3	2
7. Lexington	4,836	96,200	17	1	1
8. Louisiana..........	8,283	180,930	57	2	2
9. Mississippi	25,620	86,645	55	1	1
10. Missouri	13,244	270,260	98	3	2
11. North Carolina....	4,038	12,360	19	1	1
12. South Carolina....	22,702	101,610	87	2	2
13. St. Louis.........	14,447	404,313	155	4	2
14. Texas............	*10,000	*50,000	64	2	2
15. Tennessee.........	9,069	114,315	75	2	2
16. Virginia..........	4,415	142,550	42	1	1
17. West Virginia.....	22,965	447,200	117	3	2
18. Washington	21,450	373,833	98	3	2
19. Wilmington.......	21,217	1,069,611	117	4	2
Total..........	285,257	$6,364,422	1,546	45	32

The showing thus tabled may be briefly stated in words. The Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States embraces one fourth of her entire membership; almost one fifth of the houses of worship (or 2,405 out of 13,373;) more than one sixth of the traveling preachers; nearly one sixth of the Sunday-school children, and more than one tenth of the Church property, (or over six millions.) The benevolent collections are more than one twelfth of the yearly revenue of the Church, and rapidly increasing. The ministerial delegates from the South to the next General Conference will be nearly

---

* Estimated.

one sixth of that body, and their lay delegates will be quite one fourth of the entire lay representation.

With this summary the historic narrative closes. It has been of necessity a plea and a defense, because the right to exist is denied to these societies by the "Church South," and has been questioned by some at the North. Moreover, the character of their work was mistaken and misrepresented even in the house of their friends. Uninformed as to the strength, effectiveness, and growing prosperity thereof, some were so unreasonable as to suppose that a large portion of the work might even now be suspended or given up wholly.

To meet these questionings it has been shown that the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South was demanded by every consideration of duty to God and man. Financial objections have been met by an array of facts and figures demonstrating unparalleled profits on investments made in church property, and also showing the small cost of the immense amount of missionary labor done. Questions of ecclesiastical etiquette have been dwarfed into utter insignificance in the imposing presence of hungry millions perishing for want of knowledge and crying for the bread of life. Alleged damage done to a sister Methodism is contradicted by its improved condition and growing prosperity, while the enlargement of the late Border Conferences, and the growth of the others aggregate a wealth of numbers, substance, and ecclesiastical power which make it as impossible as it would be impolitic to debar the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States from a position and a portion with the more venerable and highly-honored members of the family.

CONCLUSIONS SUBMITTED.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States has become an established fact. Expulsion by its enemies, or removal by its friends, is absolutely impossible. Such an exodus will never furnish a chapter of future American history.

If the entire ministerial force that was sent to the South should be withdrawn from the late Mission Conferences it would take away about fifty persons. Five hundred and eighty of their traveling preachers have grown up with the one sixth of that body, and their lay delegates will be quite one fourth of the entire lay representation.

With this summary the historic narrative closes. It has been of necessity a plea and a defense, because the right to exist is denied to these societies by the "Church South," and has been questioned by some at the North. Moreover, the character of their work was mistaken and misrepresented even in the house of their friends. Uninformed as to its strength, effectiveness, and growing prosperity thereof, some were so unreasonable as to suppose that a large portion of the work might even now be suspended or given up wholly.

To meet these questionings it has been shown that the presence of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South was demanded by every consideration of duty to God and man. Financial objections have been met by an array of facts and figures demonstrating unparalleled profits on investments made in church property, and also showing the small cost of the immense amount of missionary labor done. Questions of ecclesiastical etiquette have been dwarfed into utter insignificance in the imposing presence of hungry millions perishing for want of knowledge and crying for the bread of life. Alleged damage done to a sister Methodism is contradicted by its improved condition and growing prosperity, while the enlargement of the late Border Conferences, and the growth of the others aggregate a wealth of numbers, substance, and ecclesiastical power which make it as impossible as it would be impolitic to dethrone the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States from a position and a portion with the more venerable and highly honored members of the family.

Concluding Statements

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States has become an established fact. Expulsion by its enemies, or removal by its friends, is absolutely impossible. Such an exodus will never furnish a chapter of future American history.

If the entire ministerial force that was sent to the South should be withdrawn from the late Mission Conferences it would take away about fifty percent. Five hundred and eighty of their traveling preachers have grown up with the work. Many of them are natives of the South, and a large majority of these were bondmen, who have paid their footing at a price of unrequited labor and long years of suffering that must foreclose all questionings as to their absolute right to stay.

And the recent elevation of these last named from chattelhood to manhood, with their subsequent ordination to the Christian ministry by the Methodist Episcopal Church, are reasons for her continuance among them which should silence all gainsaying. They are the Divine sanction, written in unmistakable characters, authenticating the apostleship of the laborers who were sent to the Southern field. "If (we) be not apostles unto others, yet doubtless (we are) to you: for the seal of (our) apostleship are ye in the Lord." Will the Church disturb or break that seal? Shall their parchments be dishonored or torn to tatters? Who dares so to advise?

Nor these alone. The one hundred and thirty-five thousand members in full communion, the tens of thousands of probationers, and the vast multitude who attend upon the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, are so many additional unanswerable arguments against its removal in whole or in part, and in demonstration of the impossibility of its being expelled from even the remotest part of the South. The old obsolete idea of colonizing the whole slave population of the United States on the shores of Africa was not more preposterous than is such a proposition.

As supposed transient occupants of the extreme South for mere personal, political, or sectional purposes, the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been by other Churches there assailed, stigmatized, despised. That misapprehension, and its unseemly exhibitions, must pass away entirely before the demonstration of a permanent occupancy for the achievement of a grand Christian missionary purpose such as is now developing in the seventh year of its history: a purpose which indicates its purity of motive in not settling down amid established Southern Churches—not seeking merely to build on their foundations—not reaping their rich harvest-fields—but in doing the drudgery of pioneer work, breaking up fallow ground in the interior, preaching the Gospel to the poor.

Very slowly, perhaps, will this vindication be recognized. Some prominent ministers, self-appointed representatives of Southern sentiment, yet affect to despise and frown down these efforts. They still pass by on the other side, or look the other way, to prevent even personal recognition of the laborers. Their straightened spinal column and distorted visual action must be a severer tax on their own muscle and nerve than it is damaging to their supposed rivals. But there is behind them a change going on in public sentiment among their own friends which these gentlemen must recognize, or it will yet ignore them. That change has the following groundwork.

The immense capital of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the South embraces not only a numerous communion and wealth of property, but also an increasing power of public sentiment. Whatever benefits a class, especially the lowly in society, is a blessing to the community. Sooner or later it must be acknowledged; and the work of six hundred and thirty traveling preachers, even in the extreme portions of the most jealous Southern communities, is a grandly cumulative power which cannot be hid from the dullest and most jaundiced vision. Even now men of standing in Southern society, of other Churches, and of no Church, frankly admit their power for good, and also begin to query why it is that any Church, especially the "Church South" should antagonize the mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The success of that mission thus far has been the result of the wise and generous policy of the parent body domiciled at the North. And in order to the continued and fullest success in the sphere of the new Conferences, it would seem reasonable that the same policy be continued yet other years. If thrown upon their own resources too soon, these Conferences may not hold their own amid the adverse and powerful influences arrayed against them. The late "Border Conferences," to a greater extent may be able so to do. And these also, in a few years, will develop the same measure of self-support.

The conclusions arrived at by the Convention of Southern preachers and laymen are pertinent to this argument. That Convention was held in Athens, Tenn., June 15-19, 1871. It was composed of fifty-one ministers and twenty-three laymen, Very slowly, perhaps, will this vindication be recognized. Some prominent ministers, self-appointed representatives of Southern sentiment, yet affect to despise and frown down these efforts. They still pass by on the other side, or look the other way, to prevent even personal recognition of the laborers. Their straightened spinal column and distorted visual action must be a severer tax on their own muscle and nerve than it is damaging to their supposed rivals. But there is behind them a change going on in public sentiment among their own friends which these gentlemen must recognize, or it will yet ignore them. That change has the following groundwork.

The immense capital of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the South embraces not only a numerous communion and wealth of property, but also an increasing power of public sentiment. Whatever benefits a class, especially the lowly in society, is a blessing to the community. Sooner or later it must be acknowledged; and the work of six hundred and thirty traveling preachers, even in the extreme portions of the most jealous Southern communities, is a grandly cumulative power which cannot be hid from the dullest and most prejudiced vision. Even now men of standing in Southern society, of other Churches, and of no Church, frankly admit their power for good, and also begin to query why it is that any Church, especially the "Church South" should antagonize the mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The success of that mission thus far has been the result of the wise and generous policy of the parent body domiciled at the North. And in order to the continued and fullest success in the sphere of the new Conferences, it would seem advisable that the same policy be continued yet other years. If thrown upon their own resources too soon, these Conferences may not hold their own amid the adverse and powerful influences arrayed against them. The late "Border Conferences," to a greater extent may be able so to do. And these also, in a few years, will develop the same measure of self-support.

The conclusions arrived at by the Convention of Southern preachers and laymen are pertinent to this argument. That Convention was held in Athens, Tenn., June 15-18, 1871. It was composed of fifty-one ministers and twenty-three laymen.

representing nine Annual Conferences, and they were unanimous in the judgment that the following three measures were necessary, and would be adequate, to meet the demands of the Church in the extreme Southern States:

1. *Enlarged appropriations.* Not to increase the pay of any laborer, but to multiply laborers. The work now under culture, they say, is but a tithe of the open fields. They propose to diminish local appropriations yearly, and withhold aid entirely as soon as practicable, to start new missions. In this way their appointments have so rapidly increased. But this process is too slow to keep up with the opportunities that offer on every hand. Not one class, but all classes of persons are accessible, especially in remote, unoccupied inland neighborhoods.

The Gospel, in its simplicity and power, is unknown to thousands both white and black. Neighborhoods are spoken of by these laborers in that part of the South where children grow to maturity without an opportunity to hear the word of God or attend Protestant worship. And as far as efforts have been made among them by a few occasional services, the avidity with which they listen to and welcome the truth was matter of wonder and joy to the preachers.

2. *More ministerial transfers.* The small number of these during six years past has been noted already. One fifth of them have returned. Their effectiveness is matter of history. A few more of the same sort, who will abide, would be more than welcome. Why may they not be had? Are none willing to come? Is life deemed less secure? Exceptional localities there are of great peril. For these heroic men will be raised up providentially. Elsewhere the most salubrious climate generally is found. Thus these Southern laborers canvass that question.

Transfers of superior ability are demanded. The average ability of six hundred ministers, with so few men of education, and so many unlettered ones, is very moderate. Every valuable addition increases the average of power. In a most eminent degree is this true of men of African descent, with education, who may thus be introduced into the extreme Southern field. But an increase of transfers would necessitate an enlargement of appropriations to sustain them a few years.

3. *Episcopal oversight by resident bishops.* The necessity for this, and its benefits, were supposed to be so obvious that no argument was deemed necessary to demonstrate it. The language of the writer was unanimously adopted by the Athens Convention without discussion, and is reproduced here:

Whereas, within the limits of our (ten) Annual Conferences the entire College of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are all resident, and actively engaged in promoting the interests of that Church among the white people of the South; and whereas there are also bishops of three Methodist bodies (African Methodist Episcopal Church, Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church Connection, and Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America) of the people of African descent busy at work within the same limits among their own people; and whereas our own bishops, because few in number, residing at a great distance from us, and seriously overtaxed with labor, are able only to spend a few days annually with us; therefore,

Resolved, That we ask of the ensuing General Conference to consider the propriety of such an increase of the Episcopal Board, and such a distribution of their residences, as shall give to our vast territory, and large and rapidly increasing communion, more of the personal presence and valuable influence of our bishops.

Compliance with this request may perhaps be assumed as a probable event. Then the proportion of episcopal residences to be located within the Southern States might be determined by the number of Annual Conferences, their area, and the facilities for travel. There are now more than one fourth of the Annual Conferences in the South, nineteen out of seventy-two. Their area is eight hundred and fifty thousands of square miles, or more than one third of the country within the bounds of organized Annual Conferences, which is two million three hundred and eighty-eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine square miles. As the facilities of travel southward are not equal to the other sections of the nation, more time is needed to travel the same distance.

If the number of Conferences determine the question, one fourth of the bishops will reside south of Mason and Dixon's line. If the area to be traveled determine it, then one third of the bishops will reside South. And if the Board of Bishops for the next quadrennial period shall number twelve or sixteen in all, three or four will probably choose to dwell in the South. Supposing one, as now, to reside at Baltimore and one at St.

3. *Episcopal oversight by resident bishops.* The necessity for this, and its benefits, were supposed to be so obvious, that no argument was deemed necessary to demonstrate it. The language of the writer was unanimously adopted by the Athens Convention without discussion, and is reproduced here:

> *Whereas*, within the limits of our (ten) Annual Conferences the entire College of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are all resident, and actively engaged in promoting the interests of that Church among the white people of the South; and whereas there are also bishops of three Methodist bodies (African Methodist Episcopal Church, Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church Connection, and Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America) of the people of African descent busy at work within the same limits among their own people; and whereas our own bishops, because few in number, residing at a great distance from us, and seriously overtaxed with labor, are able only to spend a few days annually with us; therefore,
>
> *Resolved*, That we ask of the ensuing General Conference to consider the propriety of such an increase of the Episcopal Board, and such a distribution of their residences, as shall give to our vast territory, and large and rapidly increasing connection, more of the personal presence and valuable influence of our bishops.

Compliance with this request may perhaps be assumed as a probable event. Then the proportion of episcopal residences to be located within the Southern States might be determined by the number of Annual Conferences, their area, and the facilities for travel. There are now more than one fourth of the Annual Conferences in the South, nineteen out of seventy-two. Their area is eight hundred and fifty thousands of square miles, or more than one third of the country within the bounds of organized Annual Conferences, which is two million three hundred and eighty-eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine square miles. As the facilities of travel southward are not equal to the other sections of the nation, more time is needed to travel the same distance.

If the number of Conferences determine the question, one fourth of the bishops will reside south of Mason and Dixon's line. If the area to be traveled determine it, then one third of the bishops will reside South. And if the Board of Bishops for the next quadrennial period shall number twelve or fifteen in all, three or four will probably choose to dwell in the South. Supposing one, as now, to reside at Baltimore and one at

Louis, there would be two who would be made gladly welcome to a home within the limits of the late Mission Conferences. And such an arrangement, if possible, would inaugurate a new era in the history of the Church in the Southern States, whose sequel, four years hence, no anticipations can adequately portray.

If, however, these three measures are not adopted, and the same relation is maintained between the Northern and Southern Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church that now exists, the embarrassments of the latter will be a serious detriment to any such success as the first six years' labor was crowned with. What are these embarrassments? The question is answered frankly.

At present the entire Episcopal Board, the Benevolent Agencies, and Publishing Centers are all domiciled at the North. Their remoteness from the latest organized Southern Conferences makes these, geographically, remote colonies. The ministers transfered there, if poorly sustained by the home authorities or funds, in many cases return after a very few years. Episcopal visitations are too much after the model of foreign travelers in haste to be at their far-off homes again. Permanency of organization is hindered thereby. Every thing has the semblance of mere experiment. The Southern people regard these transient itinerant ministers and the flying angels of the general superintendency as merely a corps of observation, which may or may not dwell in their midst. Even those who abide are regarded as having not quite stayed their time out. Under these circumstances the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States must remain for indefinite years unrecognized as an established institution of that country.

So they judge who at this period are assigned to duty in the South. They earnestly desire the eye and ear of their brethren who dwell at the centers of influence and direct the forces of the Church under God. This paper is prepared in that behalf. It purports to furnish ample reasons for the action desired on behalf of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States.

Louis, there would be two who would be made gladly welcome to a home within the limits of the late Mission Conference. And such an arrangement, if possible, would inaugurate a new era in the history of the Church in the Southern States, whose sequel, four years hence, no anticipations can adequately portray.

If, however, these three measures are not adopted, and the same relation is maintained between the Northern and Southern Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church that now exists, the embarrassments of the latter will be a serious detriment to any such success as the first six years' labor was crowned with. What are these embarrassments? The question is answered frankly.

At present the entire Episcopal Board, the Benevolent Agencies, and Publishing Centers are all domiciled at the North. Their remoteness from the latest organized Southern Conferences makes these, geographically, remote colonies. The ministers transferred there, if poorly sustained by the home authorities or funds, in many cases return after a very few years. Episcopal visitations are too much after the model of foreign travelers in haste to be at their far-off homes again. Permanency of organization is hindered thereby. Every thing has the semblance of mere experiment. The Southern people regard these transient itinerant ministers and the flying angels of the general superintendency as merely a corps of observation, which may or may not dwell in their midst. Even those who abide are regarded as having not quite stayed their time out. Under these circumstances the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States must remain for indefinite years unrecognized as an established institution of that country.

So they judge who at this period are assigned to duty in the South. They earnestly desire the eye and ear of their brethren who dwell at the centers of influence and direct the forces of the Church under God. This paper is prepared in that behalf. It purports to furnish ample reasons for the action desired on behalf of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States.

ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, October, 1871. (New York.)—1. Faith, its Place and Prerogative. 2. The Hebrew Bible: together with Biographical Sketches of Professors Henry B. Mills, D.D., and Rev. James E. Pierce. 3. The Authority of the Old Testament as a Rule of Duty. 4. Term-Service in the Eldership. 5. The Judicial Trial of Jesus. 6. The Antagonisms, Perils, and Glory of the Spiritual Philosophy. 7. The Epistle of Barnabas. 8. Explorations in Palestine. 9. Recent Arabic and Hebrew Literature. 10. Charles Scribner.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, October, 1871. (Philadelphia.)—1. Church Finances. 2. Pastoral Authority. 3. Preparation of the World for the Introduction of Christianity. 4. The Lively Experiment. 5. The Antiquity of Man. 6. The First Formation of Independent Churches. 7. Exegetical Studies.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, AND THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC, October, 1871. (Andover, Mass.)—1. Prehistoric Literature. 2. Revelation and Inspiration. 3. Instinct. 4. The Divine Agency in the Establishment, Administration, and Triumph of Christ's Kingdom. 5. The Three Fundamental Methods of Preaching—The Writing of Sermons. 6. Reply to Dr. Fiske on Romans v, 12–21. 7. Perkins's Tuscan Sculptors.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1871. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Gospels. 2. Is the Jewish Sabbath now in Force? 3. "Classic Baptism." 4. Gift of the Holy Spirit. 5. Wuttke on the Ethics of Clothes. 6. Outlines of History of Immersion and Sprinkling. 7. The Nature of the Office of the Presbytery.

NEW ENGLANDER, October, 1871. (New Haven.)—1. The Poetry of William Morris. 2. Christianity in its Progressive Relations. 3. The Ground of Confidence in Inductive Reasoning. 4. Cultis Ventris. 5. Yale College—Some Thoughts Respecting its Future. Fifth Article. 6. The Theory of the Extinction of the Wicked. 7. Rothe on Revelation and Inspiration. 8. Railways and the State.

NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER, October, 1871. (Boston.)—1. The Future of American History. 2. The Broomfield Family. 3. The Pennington Family. 4. Record Book of the First Church in Charlestown. 5. Local Law in Massachusetts, Historically Considered. 6. Browne Family Letters. 7. The Winslow Family. 8. Descendants of Jonas Deane, of Scituate, Mass. 9. Notes on Early Ship Building in Massachusetts. 10. Reminiscences of an Octogenarian. 11. Thomas and John Lake. 12. William Vaughan and William Tufts, Jr., at Louisbourg, 1745. 13. Rev. Nathaniel Gookin, of Hampton, N. H. 14. Memoir of David Reed. 15. William Duane and the Philadelphia Aurora.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, October, 1871. (Boston.)—1. Volcanism and Mountain-Building. 2. The Regeneration of Italy. 3. The Misgovernment of New York—A Remedy Suggested. 4. Language and Education. 5. French and German Diplomacy after Sadowa.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1871. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Circumcision—The Token and Seal of the Abrahamic Covenant. 2. Divinity of Christ. 3. A Call to the Ministry. 4. The Works of Philip Lindsley, D.D. 5. The Office of Ruling Elder in the Church. 6. Practical Theology—Entering upon the Ministry. 7. Doctrinal Declaration.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, October, 1871. (Gettysburg.) 1. New Obedience. 2. The Religious Training of the Children of the Church. 3. The Apocalypse of St. John. 4. Church Problems Solved by History. 5. Papal Infallibility. 6. Literary Intelligence.

The Quarterly of our American Lutheran Church under its new editors is decidedly improved in form, scholarship, and

ability. The third article is a translation from the French of the eminent biblical scholar Reuss. It is an essay upon the Apocalypse, giving a very keen analysis of its contents, and a professed solution of its meaning. It mainly coincides with the solution made familiar to American scholars in Professor Stuart's Commentary, but stripped of the guise by which the American professor endeavored to remove the destructive consequences of the scheme. Really it not only makes the Apocalypse a false prophecy, but, in view of the very conclusive proof existing that the Apostle John is its author, it shakes to the foundations all apostolic authority in the matter of faith.

The assumptions are that the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Galba, the successor of Nero; that Nero is the beast of seven heads and ten horns; and that the Apocalyptist predicts that, in forty-two months from date, both Nero and the city of Rome (under the name of Babylon) shall be destroyed by the personal advent of Christ, coming to establish the millennial kingdom of saints in resurrection. The Apocalypse is then nothing more than a very elaborate expression, constructed by the Apostle John, of the notion of the Apostolic Christians, that the second advent was close at hand. In it John announces, in the reign of Galba, that Christ will reappear in three years and a half. The following extract will illustrate these points:

"The Apocalypses of Daniel, Enoch, and Ezra pursue the same chronological method, in counting likewise series of kings to set the reader right in reference to dates. Five of these kings have already died, (v. 10;) the sixth is reigning at the very moment. The sixth emperor of Rome is Galba, a man seventy-three years old when he ascended the throne. The catastrophe, in which the city and empire are to be destroyed, will take place in three years and a half, as before declared. For this only and simple reason the series of the emperors will have but one more after him who is then reigning, and this one will reign but a short time. The author does not know him, but he knows the relative duration of his reign, because he knows definitely that Rome will perish in three years and a half, not to rise again.

"Afterward an eighth emperor will come, who is one of the seven, and who is, at the same time, the beast that was, but is not at this moment. John means, consequently, one of the preceding emperability. The third article is a translation from the French of the eminent biblical scholar Renan. It is an essay upon the Apocalypse, giving a very keen analysis of its contents, and a professed solution of its meaning. It mainly coincides with the solution made familiar to American scholars in Professor Stuart's Commentary, but stripped of the gloss by which the American professor endeavored to remove the destructive consequences of the scheme. Really it not only makes the Apocalypse a false prophecy, but, in view of the very conclusive proof existing that the Apostle John is its author, it shakes to the foundations all apostolic authority in the matter of faith.

The assumptions are that the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Galba, the successor of Nero; that Nero is the beast of seven heads and ten horns; and that the Apocalyptist predicts that, in forty-two months from date, both Nero and the city of Rome (under the name of Babylon) shall be destroyed by the personal advent of Christ, coming to establish the millennial kingdom of saints in resurrection. The Apocalypse is then nothing more than a very elaborate expression, constructed by the Apostle John, of the notion of the Apostolic Christians, that the second advent was close at hand. In it John announces, in the reign of Galba, that Christ will reappear in three years and a half. The following extracts will illustrate these points:

"The Apocalypses of Daniel, Enoch, and Ezra, pursue the same chronological method, in counting likewise series of kings to set the reader right in reference to dates. Five of these kings have already died, (v. 10;) the sixth is reigning at the very moment. The sixth emperor of Rome is Galba, a man seventy-three years old when he ascended the throne. The catastrophe, in which the city and empire are to be destroyed, will take place in three years and a half, as before declared. For this only and simple reason the series of the emperors will have but one more after him who is then reigning, and this one will reign but a short time. The author does not know him, but he declares the relative duration of his reign, because he knows definitely that Rome will perish in three years and a half, not to rise again.

"Afterward an eighth emperor will come, who is one of the seven, and who is, at the same time, the beast that was, but is not at this moment. John means, consequently, one of the preceding emperors, who will come a second time, but as Antichrist; that is to say, invested with all the power of that demon, and with the special in, tent to make war on the Lord. As it is said that he is not at this time, but was already, he, therefore, must be one of the first five. He has received a deadly wound in times of old, (chap. xiii, 3,) so that his coming back is somewhat miraculous. It is therefore neither Augustus, nor Tiberius, nor Claudius, none of whom lost his life by a violent death, and of whom, moreover, nobody will think, because not hostile to the Church. This last argument will also exclude Caligula. There remains but Nero, and all circumstances combine to point him out as the personage so mysteriously designated. As long as Galba was reigning, and long afterward, people did not believe Nero dead; he was said to be somewhere concealed, and prepared to come back to avenge himself on his enemies. The Messianic notions of the Jews, of which a vague knowledge had reached the West, according to the testimony of Tacitus and Suetonius, commingled with these expectations, and suggested to credulous persons the opinion that Nero would return from the East to conquer his throne with the assistance of the Parthians. Several false Neros presented themselves, (Suetonius, Ner., 40, 57; Tacitus, Hist., i, 2; ii, 8, 9; Dio Cassius, lxiv, 9; Zonaras, Vita Tit., p. 578; Dio Chrys., Or. 20, p. 371, D.) These popular fancies spread also among the Christians. The Apocalypses refer incessantly to them, (Visio Jesaj. Æthiopica; Libri Sibyll., iv, 116; v, 33; viii, 1-216;) and the Fathers of the Church attest that for several centuries they were not forgotten, (Sulpit. Sever., ii, 367; August., Cir. Dei, xx, 19; Lactant., Mort. Persec., c. 2; Hieron. ad Dan. xi, 28; ad Esaj. xvii, 13; Chrysost. ad 2 Thess. ii, 7.)

"Finally, to render our proofs more conclusive, we remark that the name of Nero is, so to say, written at full length in our book. It is contained in the number 666. The mechanism of the problem reposes on one of the cabalistical contrivances used in Jewish hermeneutics, and which consists in calculating the numerical value of the letters of which a word is composed. This proceeding, called *Ghematria*, or geometrical, that is, mathematical, and used by the Jews in the interpretation of the Old Testament, has given much trouble to our scholars, and led them into a labyrinth of errors. All ancient and modern alphabets, all imaginable combinations of numbers and letters, have been tried. It is known that interpreters have believed, and sincerely maintained, that nearly all the historical names of the past eighteen centuries have been pointed out by this number. They have severally found in it Titus Vespa-

sianus and Simon Gioras, Julianus the Apostate and Genseric, Mohammed and Luther, Benedict IX. and Louis XV., Napoleon I. and the Duke of Reichstadt; and we could enjoy ourselves in finding the names of contemporaries, yea, our own. After all, the enigma was not so difficult, though exegesis has solved it only in our day. I can claim the honor of having first found the solution, although several German scholars have found it soon after me' and without knowing my solution. The *Ghematria* is a Hebrew art. It is ~~by the~~ Hebraic alphabet that the meaning of the number will be found. One will read נרון קסר, Neron Cæsar : נ 50× ר 200×ו 6×נ 50×ק 100×ס 60×ר 200=666. It is most remarkable that there exists a very old manuscript which substitutes the number 616 for 666. This reading must proceed from a Latin reader of the Apocalypse, who also had found the solution, but who pronounced *Nero* as the Romans did, while the author pronounced *Neron* with the Greeks and Orientals. By cutting off the final Nun the name has only a numerical value of 616."

The apocalyptic text, however, and the history of Nero, vary in a very important particular. The beast is wounded to death, and rises again from the dead; but Nero was held by rumor not at all to have been slain, and the popular expectation implied not a resurrection but a re-appearance. Alford says, "The first who mentions the idea of Nero returning from the dead is Augustine. But it is observable that Augustine does not connect the idea with the Apocalypse. This is first done by Sulpitius Severus, and completed by Victorinus, whose very words betray the origin of the idea having been from the passage itself." The overwhelming evidence is that the Apocalypse was written, not in the time of Galba, but of Domitian, five reigns later; consequently, if the heads were the Roman Emperors there must have been more than *five* that *are fallen*, and the *one* that *now is* could not have been Nero. The entire picture of the Seven Churches of Asia in the earlier chapters of Revelation indicates a later age than that of Nero, almost within the life-time of Paul. The attempted proof of an earlier date from the symbolic introduction of Jerusalem in chapter xiii has no value, and the attempted proofs based on the allusions in the sacred text to the state of persecution existing disprove the earlier and demonstrate the later date. The whole Neronic theory we consider as very dangerous were it not palpably false.

sions and Simon Magus, Julian the Apostate and Genseric, Mohammed and Luther, Benedict IX. and Louis XV., Napoleon I. and the Duke of Reichstadt; and we could enjoy ourselves in finding the names of contemporaries, yes, our own. After all, the enigma was not so difficult, though exegesis unriddled it only in our day. I can claim the honour of having first found the solution, although several German scholars have found it since after me and without knowing my solution. The Apocalypse is a Hebrew art. It is by the Hebrew alphabet that the meaning of the number will be found. One will read נרון קסר, Nerôn Kesar; נ 50, ר 200, ו 6, ן 50; ק 100, ס 60, ר 200 = 666. It is most remarkable that there exists a very old manuscript which substitutes the number 616 for 666. This reading must proceed from a Latin reader of the Apocalypse, who also had found the solution, but who pronounced Nero as the Romans did, while the author pronounced Neron with the Greeks and Orientals. By cutting off the final Nun the name has only a numerical value of 616."

The apocalyptic text, however, and the history of Nero, vary in a very important particular. The beast is wounded to death, and rises again from the dead; but Nero was held by rumor not at all to have been slain, and the popular expectation implied not a resurrection but a re-appearance. Alford says, "The first who mentions the idea of Nero returning from the dead is Augustine. But it is observable that Augustine does not connect the idea with the Apocalypse. This is first done by Sulpitius Severus, and completed by Victorinus, whose very words betray the origin of the idea having been from the passage itself." The overwhelming evidence is that the Apocalypse was written, not in the time of Galba, but of Domitian, five reigns later; consequently, if the heads were the Roman Emperors there must have been more than six that are fallen, and the one that now is would not have been Nero. The entire picture of the Seven Churches of Asia in the earlier chapters of Revelation indicates a later age than that of Nero, almost within the lifetime of Paul. The attempted proof of an earlier date from the symbolic introduction of Jerusalem in chapter xiii has no value, and the attempted proofs based on the allusions in the sacred text to the state of persecution existing disprove the earlier and demonstrate the later date. The whole Neronic theory we consider as very dangerous were it not palpably false.

The discovery of the number 666 in the Hebrew Nero Cæsar avails nothing. There is no difficulty in adjusting any number of names to the number, and none is of any value unless sustained by some early authority, as *Lateinos* by Irenæus and Hippolytus.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, October, 1871. (New York.)—1. Introduction to a New System of Rhetoric. 2. The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber. 3. Future Retribution. 4. Plan in History. 5. The Wine of the Bible, of Bible Lands, and of the Lord's Supper. 6. Church Action on Temperance.

The Article on the Wine of the Bible, so far as we can see, demonstrates that the distinction between the harmless and harmful sort of wines in the New Testament is unsustainable. We were inclined to say that we wish it could be answered, though what answer there is we do not know. But this much we must maintain, that the throwing odium on the men who lay open to view the truth as it is, is itself a wickedness. We must not undertake to lie for God, or for morality, or for righteousness' sake. It is a hideous contradiction to base morality upon an immoral ground.

Mr. Beecher in his "Life of Christ" yields the point that we must not assume or maintain that the wine of Christ's miracle was unintoxicating when taken in excess. He quotes the "Congregational Review" as saying, "the biblical scholars of Andover, Princeton, Newton, Chicago, and New Haven" all reject the distinction of the two wines. "One of the most learned and devout scholars of the country said to us: 'None but a third-rate scholar adopts the view that the Bible describes two kinds of wines.' The National Temperance Society has done its best to create a different popular belief, if not to cast odium on those who do not adopt its error. We regret it."

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, October, 1871. (London.)—1. Chillingworth. 2. On the Volcanoes and Earthquakes of Scripture. 3. The Variation of Languages and Species. 4. Symbolism in the Gospel of St. John. 5. Dr. William Cunningham. Reprinted Article: The Hazors of Scripture.

British Quarterly Review, October, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Dr. Carl Ullmann. 2. Aerial Voyages. 3. Early Sufferings of the Free Church of Scotland. 4. The Romance of the Rose. 5. Letters and Letter Writing. 6. Wesley and Wesleyanism. 7. Mr. Darwin on the Origin of Man. 8. The Session.

The discovery of the number 666 in the Hebrew Nero Cæsar avails nothing. There is no difficulty in adjusting any number of names to the number, and none is of any value unless sustained by some early authority, as Lateinos by Irenæus and Hippolytus.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, October, 1871. (New York.)—1. Introduction to a New System of Dialectic. 2. The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber. 3. Future Retribution. 4. Proof in History. 5. The Wine of the Bible, of Bible Lands, and of the Lord's Supper. 6. Church Action on Temperance.

The Article on the Wine of the Bible, so far as we can see, demonstrates that the distinction between the harmless and harmful sort of wines in the New Testament is unmaintainable. We were inclined to say that we wish it could be sustained, though what avails there is we do not know. But this much we must maintain, that the throwing odium on the men who lay open to view the truth as it is, is itself a wickedness. We must not undertake to lie for God, or for morality, or for righteousness' sake. It is a hideous contradiction to base morality upon an immoral ground.

Mr. Beecher in his "Life of Christ" yields the point that we must not assume or maintain that the wine of Christ's miracle was unintoxicating when taken in excess. He quotes the "Congregational Review" as saying, "the biblical scholars of Andover, Princeton, Newton, Chicago, and New Haven" all reject the distinction of the two wines. "One of the most learned and devout scholars of the country said to us: 'None but a third-rate scholar adopts the view that the Bible describes two kinds of wines.' The National Temperance Society has done its best to create a different popular belief, if not to cast odium on those who do not adopt its error. We regret it."

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, October, 1871. (London.)—1. [illegible] 2. On the Tolerance and Intolerance of Scripture. 3. The [illegible] of Languages and Species. 4. [illegible] 5. Dr. William Cunningham. Important Article: The Gospel of the [illegible]

British Quarterly Review, October, 1871. (New York: Leonard Scott.)—1. The Fathers [illegible] Dr. Karl [illegible] 2. Aerial Voyages. 3. [illegible] Relations of the Free Church of Scotland. 4. The Romance of the [illegible] 5. Letters and Letter Writing. 6. Wesley and Wesleyanism. 7. Mr. Darwin on the Origin of Man. 8. The Session.

London Quarterly Review, October, 1871. (London.)—1. Somersetshire; Past and Present. 2. Nathaniel Hawthorne's Life and Writings. 3. Jowett's Plato. 4. Pauperism. 5. Flints and their Evidence. 6. The Political and Ecclesiastical Situation.

Perhaps no Quarterly of October surpasses the (Wesleyan) London in the interest and ability of its articles. There is an appreciative, perhaps over apologetic, discussion of Hawthorne, an elegant and erudite treatment of Plato, a critical assault on modern theories of geological man, and a brilliant essay on the ecclesiastical affairs of England.

In the Fifth Article a geological expert riddles the argument for the miocene gentleman, derived from flints, with very sharp shafts. He arraigns Sir John Lubbock as mistaking the "unhistorical" for "pre-historic." Sir John simply assumes that the more savage is of course the more primitive. If that were true, we have all ages existing in the world now; for man exists in every stage of civilization at the present moment on the face of the earth. The map is a chronological table. It is a very debatable notion that the primitive man was a barbarian; and an open question whether all barbarism is not degeneracy, and whether the first age was not an age of wise simplicity, and the primitive period, as it is really described by Genesis, a period of arts and invention.

"Sir John Lubbock divides the stone period into two eras: the first of rude, the second of better, stone implements; and he calls the former the *palæolithic*, the latter the *neolithic* age. . . . Yet no antiquary can give us even the proximate date of the commencement of either of the four eras, or proof of their succession. The calendar, as applied to a particular district—Denmark or Tierra del Fuego, for example—may have its use, but as a general calendar it is preposterous, for it assumes that men have been in the same state at each era all over the world; an assumption about as far from reason and history as is possible. The iron age of Palestine in Solomon's day was probably a stone age in Scandinavia; and the iron age of Britain was, till lately, a stone age in the Pacific, and in some islands is so still. Sir John Lubbock, indeed, applies the fourfold classification at present only in Europe, adding that 'in all probability it might be extended also to the neighboring regions of Asia and Africa.' But such limitation helps him not, for Europe has been as much distinguished in past times

London Quarterly Review, October, 1871. (New York Reprint.) 1. [illegible] Past and Present. 2. Nathaniel Hawthorne [illegible] 3. [illegible] 4. Pauperism. 5. Flints and their Evidence. 6. [illegible] and Statesmen.

Perhaps no Quarterly of October surpasses the (Wesleyan) London in the interest and ability of its articles. There is an appreciative, perhaps over apologetic, discussion of Hawthorne, an elegant and erudite treatment of Plato, a brilliant assault on modern theories of geological man, and a brilliant essay on the ecclesiastical affairs of England.

In the Fifth Article a geological expert riddles the argument for the unknown gentleman, derived from flints, with very sharp shafts. He arraigns Sir John Lubbock as mistaking the "unhistorical" for "pre-historic." Sir John simply assumes that the more savage is of course the more primitive. If that were true, we have all ages existing in the world now; for man exists in every stage of civilization at the present moment on the face of the earth. "The map is a chronological table. It is a very debatable notion that the primitive man was a barbarian; and an open question whether all barbarism is not degeneracy, and whether the first age was not an age of wise simplicity, and the primitive period, as it is really described by Genesis, a period of arts and invention.

"Sir John Lubbock divides the stone period into two ages: the first of rude, the second of better, stone implements; and he calls the former the *palæolithic*, the latter the *neolithic* age. . . . Yet no antiquary can give us even the proximate date of the commencement of either of the four eras, or proof of their succession. The calendar, as applied to a particular district—Denmark or Tierra del Fuego, for example—may have its use, but as a general calendar it is preposterous, for it assumes that men have been in the same stage at each era all over the world; an assumption about as far from reason and history as is possible. The iron age of Palestine in Solomon's day was probably a stone age in Scandinavia; and the iron age of Britain was, till lately, a stone age in the Pacific, and in some islands is so still. Sir John Lubbock, indeed, applies the fourfold classification at present only in Europe, adding that 'in all probability it might be extended also to the neighboring regions of Asia and Africa.' But such limitation helps him not, for Europe has been as much distinguished in past times by diversities of civilization and barbarism as other parts of the earth. It will not, we presume, be doubted that there were savages making flint implements in some parts of Europe while in Greece Phidias was working in marble and ivory. The succession of terms, palæolithic, neolithic, bronze and iron, has a look of learning, but it represents a fiction. Neither the world, nor any one quarter of it, has ever been so divided.

"The course of the human race has not been that of a river, but that of the tides, advancing at one time and place, receding at another time and place. For example, the people on the west coast of Greenland attained to the use of metal. Intercourse with Europe ceased for about three hundred years, and then—according to a statement in *Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ*—they had returned to the use of stone."

The writer admits the artificial chipping of the neolithic flints, but denies their stupendous antiquity. He admits the antiquity of the palæolithic, but denies their construction by human hands; so that there are no flints which are both palæolithic and manufactured.

"We enter into no controversy about the origin of those rightly called neolithic, which are found in many parts of the world, and are, beyond all question, works of art. There is no large town in England in which some of these interesting relics may not be seen; relics so obviously fashioned by design that they carry their own indisputable evidence with them to every beholder: and pleasant it is to know that inquisitive men in all nations carefully preserve them."

But upon the palæolithic flint our reviewer pours volumes of profound contempt. Their first discoverer was "M. Boucher de Perthes, a gentleman of Picardy, and author of more than forty volumes" on the flint.

"M. Boucher de Perthes began, when a young man, to observe the gravel cuttings of his neighborhood, and thought that some of the flints there disinterred showed signs of manufacture. He pursued his investigations for a long time, and in the year 1846 published a volume descriptive of his discoveries and opinions, which was followed, in 1857, by a second, and in 1864, by a third. For years after the publication of his first volume his views found acceptance with very few, and by the many he 'was looked upon as an enthusiast, almost as a mad-by diversities of civilization and barbarism as other parts of the earth. It will not, we presume, be denied that there were savages making flint implements in some parts of Europe while in Greece Phidias was working in marble and ivory. The succession of terms, palæolithic, neolithic, bronze and iron, has a look of learning, but it represents a fiction. Neither the world, nor any one quarter of it, has ever been so divided.

"The course of the human race has not been that of a river, but that of the tides, advancing at one time and place, receding at another time and place. For example, the people on the west coast of Greenland attained to the use of metal. Intercourse with Europe ceased for about three hundred years, and then—according to a statement in *Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ*—they had returned to the use of stone."

The writer admits the artificial chipping of the neolithic flints, but denies their stupendous antiquity. He admits the antiquity of the palæolithic, but denies their construction by human hands; so that there are no flints which are both palæolithic and manufactured.

"We enter into no controversy about the origin of those rightly called neolithic, which are found in many parts of the world, and are, beyond all question, works of art. There is no large town in England in which some of these interesting relics may not be seen; relics so obviously fashioned by design that they carry their own indisputable evidence with them to every beholder: and pleasant it is to know that inquisitive men in all nations carefully preserve them."

But upon the palæolithic flint our reviewer pours volumes of profound contempt. Their first discoverer was "M. Boucher de Perthes, a gentleman of Picardy, and author of more than forty volumes" on the flint.

"M. Boucher de Perthes began, when a young man, to observe the gravel cuttings of his neighborhood, and thought that some of the flints there disinterred showed signs of manufacture. He pursued his investigations for a long time, and in the year 1846 published a volume descriptive of his discoveries and opinions, which was followed, in 1857, by a second, and in 1864, by a third. For years after the publication of his first volume his views found acceptance with very few, and by the many he 'was looked upon as an enthusiast, almost as a mad-man.' The flints engraved in the plates of his first volume showed no signs of art, but were such chips as may be picked up in abundance wherever flints are common. The same remark applies to the flints pictured in his second and third volumes—the three containing a hundred and eighteen plates and two thousand two hundred and four figures, and affording a marvelous example of credulity. The general impression among English geologists, we believe, is, that M. Boucher de Perthes was, in his favorite pursuit, a visionary; for he believed not only that the chips of flints he collected and exhibited showed traces of design, but that the *lusus naturæ* which he found—that is, resemblances of animals or parts of animals—were the fruits of design also; and that from them there might be obtained a very considerable augmentation of our knowledge of the natural history of by-gone ages."

M. Boucher de Perthes it was who disclosed the renowned Abbeville flints to the world, and thereby obtained world-wide renown. It was even claimed that a certain human jaw-bone was there found, but the jaw-bone proved an imposture. Yet M. Boucher de Perthes had the jaw-bone conjured by spiritualism, and the ghost of the man was induced to testify that his name was Yoé, and gave a full account of the geological age in which he existed. The account was sent as a scientific voucher to England, and covers two pages of this Review.

A great collector and champion of the palæolithic flints is a Mr. John Evans, of whom our Review says:

"We point also to Mr. Evans's specimens, and assert unhesitatingly that pecks of such fragments, the result of natural fracture, may be gleaned in any flinty region; nor is it credible that savages, though in many respects very stolid, were so stupid as to spend labor in making stone chips, when they could pick up almost anywhere better implements ready made; and, finally, we infer that if antiquaries find it necessary to ply us with such evidence as has been described, the palæolithic age of man is a fable not cunningly devised. Confidently and earnestly we ask our readers whether they are prepared to be disciples in a school which teaches them to discard history, and accept as one of the main foundations of their faith such pieces of flint as our plate exhibits.

"In the 'Popular Science Review' for April, 1867, and Jan-man.' The flints engraved in the plates of his first volume showed no signs of art, but were such chips as may be picked up in abundance wherever flints are common. The same remark applies to the flints pictured in his second and third volumes—the three containing a hundred and eighteen plates and two thousand two hundred and four figures, and affording a marvelous example of credulity. The general impression among English geologists, we believe, is, that M. Boucher de Perthes was, in his favorite pursuit, a visionary; for he believed not only that the chips of flints he collected and exhibited showed traces of design, but that the *lusus naturæ* which he found—that is, resemblances of animals or parts of animals—were the fruits of design also; and that from them there might be obtained a very considerable augmentation of our knowledge of the natural history of bygone ages."

M. Boucher de Perthes it was who disclosed the renowned Abbeville flints to the world, and thereby obtained world-wide renown. It was even claimed that a certain human *jaw-bone* was there found, but the jaw-bone proved an imposture. Yet M. Boucher de Perthes had the jaw-bone conjured by spiritualism, and the ghost of the man was induced to testify that his name was Yok, and gave a full account of the geological age in which he existed. The account was sent as a scientific voucher to England, and covers two pages of this Review.

A great collector and champion of the palæolithic flints is a Mr. John Evans, of whom our Review says:

"We point also to Mr. Evans's specimens, and assert unhesitatingly that pecks of such fragments, the result of natural fracture, may be gleaned in any flinty region; nor is it credible that savages, though in many respects very stolid, were so stupid as to spend labor in making stone chips, when they could pick up almost anywhere better implements ready made; and, finally, we infer that if antiquaries find it necessary to ply us with such evidence as has been described, the palæolithic age of man is a fable not cunningly devised. Confidently and earnestly we ask our readers whether they are prepared to be disciples in a school which teaches them to discard history, and accept as one of the main foundations of their faith such pieces of flint as our plate exhibits.

"In the 'Popular Science Review' for April, 1867, and January, 1869, there are two excellent articles on flints, by Spencer Bate, Esq., F.R.S., and N. Whitley, Esq., C.E., the first being 'An Attempt to Approximate the Date of the Flint Flakes of Devon and Cornwall,' where such flakes are abundant. They are found with pottery, bones of sheep, etc. Mr. Bate's conclusion is this: 'I contend there is no evidence to show that the flint flakes which we found scattered over the surface of Devon and Cornwall may not have been coeval with the history of the period that immediately preceded the introduction of Roman civilization into this country.' Mr. Whitley's inquiry was much more extensive. He found flint flakes wherever the chalk is, and in other places to which they had been drifted, their abundance being so great that a man may soon find more than he can carry: so great, that about half a ton weight was collected in less than an hour. Indeed, he found whole strata of those 'flint implements.' His exposure of the 'palæolithic' theory is crushing, and his facts more than justify his conclusion: 'From an extensive examination of the flakes themselves, and of their geological position, from Cornwall to Norfolk, in Belgium, and in France, I have obtained sufficient evidence to compel me to adopt the contrary opinion' to that of Lyell, Evans, and Lubbock. 'They'—the flints—'bear no indications of design, nor any evidence of use.'"

The Review examines the subject of peat-covered flints, and proves that peat growth is no reliable chronometer. He examines the pottery in the Nile mud and denies that the thickness of the mud covering the pottery is a chronometer, inasmuch as the rate of increase in early times cannot be measured by the modern rate.

"If, then, it were conceded that the entire depth of the Nile valley is to be attributed to the river, we have really no measure of its increment, for it may have amounted to fifty feet in the first century. But, besides this element of uncertainty, the whole theory of the formation of the sediment is open to question. To the east and west of Egypt lie the greatest sandy regions of the world, admitted to be the remains of an ocean which, at a time geologically recent, rolled over them. It must have rolled over Egypt too; and its residuum, we submit, is the substance of the soil of Egypt, which is called loess of the Nile. It consists of the pre-existing sand, with subsequent acary, 1869, there are two excellent articles on Flint, by Spencer Bate, Esq., F.R.S., and N. Whitley, Esq., C.E., the first being 'An Attempt to Approximate the Date of the Flint Flakes of Devon and Cornwall,' where such flakes are abundant. They are found with pottery, bones of sheep, etc. Mr. Bate's conclusion is this: "I contend there is no evidence to show that the flint flakes which are found scattered over the surface of Devon and Cornwall may not have been coeval with the history of the period that immediately preceded the introduction of Roman civilization into this country.' Mr. Whitley's inquiry was much more extensive. He traced flint flakes wherever the chalk is, and in other places to which they had been drifted, their abundance being so great that a man may soon find more than he can carry; so great, that about half a ton weight was collected in less than an hour. Indeed, he found whole strata of these 'flint implements.' His exposure of the 'palæolithic' theory is crushing, and his facts more than justify his conclusion: 'From an extensive examination of the flakes themselves, and of their geological position, from Cornwall to Norfolk, in Belgium, and in France, I have obtained sufficient evidence to compel me to adopt the contrary opinion' to that of Lyell, Evans, and Lubbock. 'They—the flints—offer no indications of design, nor any evidence of use.'"

The Review examines the subject of peat-covered flints, and proves that peat growth is no reliable chronometer. He examines the pottery in the Nile mud and denies that the thickness of the mud covering the pottery is a chronometer, inasmuch as the rate of increase in early times cannot be measured by the modern rate.

"If, then, it were conceded that the entire depth of the Nile valley is to be attributed to the river, we have really no measure of its increment, for it may have amounted to fifty feet in the first century. But, besides this element of uncertainty, the whole theory of the formation of the sediment is open to question. To the east and west of Egypt lie the greatest sandy regions of the world, admitted to be the remains of an ocean which, at a time geologically recent, rolled over them. It might have rolled over Egypt too; and its residuum, we submit, is the substance of the soil of Egypt, which is called loam of the Nile. It consists of the pre-existing sand, with subsequent cumulations by the wind, drenched century after century by the waters of the overflowing river; which, as they have trickled down into the sand, have borne down with them the fine mud held in solution, and so have changed the sand into loess. If the river by its annual inundation had formed the valley, there would have been stratification, at least lamination; whereas, in none of the excavations were even laminæ met with in a single case. The borings, which were generally stopped by water at the depth of from ten to nineteen feet, brought up not a single trace of an extinct organic body, and but few organic remains of any kind, those few consisting of recent land and river shells, and bones of domestic animals. The borings brought up also fragments of burned brick, and of pottery both coarse and ornamented. Suppose seven thousand years to have elapsed since the sea rolled over Arabia, Egypt, and the Libyan desert—since, therefore, the Nile began to flow through Lower Egypt—and we believe that all its phenomena, as at present known, are accounted for."

He ridicules the inferences drawn from "animals of the palæolithic age," especially if made to bristle with Latin names.

"Sir John Lubbock gives us a list of seventeen 'species of mammalia' included in the fauna of Northern Europe during the palæolithic period, 'which have either become entirely extinct, or very much restricted in their geographical distribution since the appearance of man in Europe:' '*Ursus spelæus*, (the cave-bear;) *U. priscus; Hyæna spelæa*, (the cave-hyæna;) *Felis spelæa*, (the cave-lion;) *Elephas primigenius*, (the mammoth;) *E. antiquus; Rhinoceros tichorhinus*, (the hairy rhinoceros;) *R. leptorhinus*, Cuv.; *R. hemitœchus; Hippopotamus major*, (the hippopotamus;) *Ovibos moschatus*, (the musk-ox;) *Megaceros Hibernicus*, (the Irish Elk;) *E. fossilis*, (the wild-horse:) *Gulo luscus*, (the glutton;) *Cervus tarandus*, (the reindeer:) *Bison Europæus*, (the aurochs;) *Bos primigenius*, (the urus.') By far the greater part of those in the above list are to be found alive now, and their bones have no more relation to 'pre-historic times' than have human bones dug from a *tumulus* or a church-yard. Sir John Lubbock himself states that 'the Irish elk, the elephants, and the three species of rhinoceros, are perhaps the only ones which are absolutely extinct;' so that on his own showing eleven out of the seventeen palæolithic fauna

may be roaming on the earth at this day. . . . Whether some of the remaining six species are not living now is very doubtful; much more is it doubtful whether they were not living fifteen hundred years ago. What geologists have to show is, not that they are extinct now—that is nothing to the purpose—but that they have not lived within the last seven thousand years, of which we venture to think there is, in respect of the Irish elk, the *Elephas antiquus*, the *Rhinoceros leptorhinus* and *hemitœchus*, no proof; and perhaps the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus* might be included; so that, of the seventeen selected examples, there are but at most two which any man has the right to affirm belong to 'pre-historic times;' for their remains are found with pottery under them, and mixed up with the remains of all the other living species, such as the red deer, roe, wild cat, wild boar, wolf, fox, weasel, beaver, hare, rabbit, hedgehog, mole, and mouse. The contents of the caves, varying greatly, show indisputably the contemporaneousness of almost all the animals in Mr. Lubbock's list with the wolf and the fox and the mouse, and with the traces of partially civilized man. 'The present evidence,' as Professor Owen says, 'does not necessitate the carrying back of the date of man in past time, so much as bringing the extinct post-glacial animals toward our own time.'"

Besides all this, man in all ages is naturally a collector of fossil remnants, either for curiosity or for use.

"About twenty years ago, in a small millstream near Kettering, there was found lying on some gravel which the stream had washed down a tooth of a mammoth, which weighed nearly fourteen pounds. It is now in the museum at Northampton. Any one who will walk through that museum, and observe its shelves, cases, windows, etc., will be quite sure that they are of human workmanship: *ergo*, the people who arranged the museum, and the mammoth, lived at the same time. The fallacy of the conclusion is as real when the tooth is found in a cave, as when it is seen in a building in Northampton. If a savage having no metals found such a tooth as has been described, he would be likely to carry it to his cave, either as a curiosity or for use. Its presence is as readily accounted for in the grotto of the barbarian as in the collection of the geologist."

The Article on ecclesiastical affairs maintains that the Church of England must remove all Romanistic tendencies, which are affirmed to be many, from her formularies, must give the control of the parish to the tithe-payers, and have her bishops appointed not by politicians, but rather by a remodeled convocation. But the writer, while advocating a broadening of the foundations of the Church, so as to deliver it from being "a sect," is opposed to disestablishment or disendowment. She must still retain the cathedrals, the parish churches, the tithes, the chaplaincies. She must afford a Christian standing for the immense number of men who desire to be Christian without selecting a sect or a creed, and without deciding whether to be Calvinistic or Arminian. The sects are to be the receptacles of more earnest minds, for whom a strict discipline, perhaps enforced class-meetings, and exacter doctrinal beliefs, are requisite. Some of the positions and arguments uttered from British Wesleyan lips would sound curiously to an American Methodist's ears.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott. 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Spiritualism and its Recent Converts. 2. Byron and Tennyson. 3. Beer, Brewing, and Public Houses. 4. Guicciardini's Personal and Political Records. 5. Continued Mismanagement of the Navy. 6. Industrial Monopolies. 7. Jowett's Plato. 8. Army Administration and Government Policy. 9. The Commune and the Internationale.

The First Article claims to be the verdict of science upon and against all the so-called Spiritual Manifestations. The author refers to the fact that eighteen years ago he furnished a most satisfactory discussion of this question to this same periodical. Since that time he has made it his specialty to investigate the phenomena at all accessible points, and finds that they may be either explained upon well-ascertained physiological principles, or are to be exploded as deceptions. Table-turning, planchette, and some other phenomena, where not deceptions, are to be explained on the principles of unconscious volition and unconscious intellection. The object is often moved by our wills without our knowing it; the manifestation often reveals what we supposed we did not know, but what we really did know without knowing that we knew. On unconscious volition we have the following expositions: "What is the 'beating of the heart' but unconscious muscular action? our consciousness being only affected by the movement when it makes itself felt by undue violence. What is the 'drawing of the breath' but in-

voluntary muscular action, of which we only become conscious when we direct our attention to it? That which is true of these instinctive or *primarily*-automatic movements is no less true—as was shown a hundred years since by Hartley—of many others, which, learned in the first instance by voluntary effort, become '*secondarily*-automatic' by habitual repetition. Has it never occurred to one of these objectors to be carried along by the 'unconscious muscular action' of his legs, while either engaged in an interesting conversation with a friend or deeply engrossed in a train of thoughts of his own, so that he finds himself at his destination before he knew that he had done more than set out toward it? Could not almost any of our fair readers remember to have played a piece of music under circumstances so distracting to her thoughts and feelings that she has come to the end without 'the least idea of how she ever got through it?'" But, touching apparently voluntary action without the will, the following is still stronger: "As far back as the year 1844 a very important memoir was published by Dr. Laycock (now Professor of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh) on the 'Reflex Action of the Brain,' in which he most distinctly showed that involuntary muscular movements take place in respondence not merely to sensations, but to ideas; and not merely at the prompting of ideas actually before the mind, but through the action of the *substrata* left by past mental operations. Thus, for example, the convulsive paroxysm of hydrophobia may be excited not merely by the sight and sound of water, but by the *idea* of water suggested either by a picture or by the verbal mention of it. But as Dr. Laycock did not at that time recognize the essential distinctness of the *sensory ganglia* from the *cerebrum*, which—being so obscurely marked in the brain of man as to be commonly overlooked—can only be properly appreciated by the student of Comparative Anatomy, he confounded together the two classes of actions of which they are the separate instruments, and his views did not receive the attention they merited. The doctrine of the 'reflex action of the sensory ganglia' having been long previously taught by Dr. Carpenter, under the title of 'Sensorimotor Activity,' he was subsequently led, by Dr. Laycock's reasoning, to see that it might be extended to the cerebrum proper; and on the 12th of March, 1852, some voluntary muscular action, of which we only become conscious when we direct our attention to it? That which is true of these instinctive or *primarily* automatic movements is no less true—as was shown a hundred years since by Hartley—of many others, which, learned in the first instance by voluntary effort, become '*secondarily* automatic' by habitual repetition. Has it never occurred to one of these objectors to be carried along by the 'unconscious muscular action' of his legs, while either engaged in an interesting conversation with a friend or deeply engrossed in a train of thoughts of his own, so that he finds himself at his destination before he knew that he had done more than set out toward it? Could not almost any of our fair readers remember to have played a piece of music under circumstances so distracting to her thoughts and feelings that she has come to the end without 'the least idea of how she ever got through it?'" But, touching apparently voluntary action without the will, the following is still stronger: "As far back as the year 1844 a very important memoir was published by Dr. Laycock (now Professor of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh) on the 'Reflex Action of the Brain,' in which he most distinctly showed that involuntary muscular movements take place in respondence not merely to sensations, but to ideas; and not merely at the prompting of ideas actually before the mind, but through the action of the substrata left by past mental operations. Thus, for example, the convulsive paroxysm of hydrophobia may be excited not merely by the sight and sound of water, but by the *idea* of water suggested either by a picture or by the verbal mention of it. But as Dr. Laycock did not at that time recognise the essential distinctness of the sensory ganglia from the cerebrum, which—being so obscurely marked in the brain of man as to be commonly overlooked—can only be properly appreciated by the student of Comparative Anatomy, he confounded together the two classes of actions of which they are the separate instruments and his views did not receive the attention they merited. The doctrine of the 'reflex action of the sensory ganglia' having been long previously taught by Dr. Carpenter, under the title of 'Sensorimotor Activity,' he was subsequently led, by Dr. Laycock's reasoning, to see that it might be extended to the cerebrum proper; and on the 12th of March, 1852, came months before the table-turning epidemic broke out, he delivered a lecture at the Royal Institution on what he termed the *Ideo-motor* principle of action, which consists in the involuntary response made by the muscles to ideas with which the mind may be possessed when the directing power of the will is in abeyance." Assuming this principle, Faraday constructed a machine by which it was demonstrated that the table-turning was the result of the muscular action of the performer.

On unconscious intellection he gives the following statement: "The psychologists of Germany, from the time of Leibnitz, have taught that much of our *mental* work is done *without consciousness;* but this doctrine, though systematically expounded by Sir W. Hamilton under the designation 'Latent Thought,' has only of late attracted the attention of physiologists. Though foreshadowed by Dr. Laycock, in his memoir of 1844 on the 'Reflex Action of the Brain,' it was not expressed with sufficient clearness to obtain recognition on the part of any of those who studied that essay with the care to which its great ability entitles it. Some years afterward, however, Dr. Carpenter was led, by considering the anatomical relation of the Cerebrum to the Sensorium, or center of consciousness, to the conclusion that *ideational* changes may take place in the cerebrum of which we may be at the time *unconscious* through a want of receptivity on the part of the sensorium, just as it is unconscious during sleep of the impressions made by visual images on the retina; but that the results of such changes may afterward present themselves to the consciousness as *ideas*, elaborated by an automatic process of which we have no cognizance. This principle of action was expounded by Dr. Carpenter, under the designation 'Unconscious Cerebration,' in the fourth edition of his 'Human Physiology,' published early in 1853—some months before any of the phenomena developed themselves to the explanation of which we now deem it applicable, and it has been of late frequently referred to under that name. The Lectures of Sir William Hamilton not having then been published, none but his own pupils were aware that the doctrine of 'Unconscious Cerebration' is really the same as that which had long previously been expounded by him as 'Latent Thought;' and the two designations may be regarded as based months before the table-turning epidemic broke out, he delivered a lecture at the Royal Institution on what he termed the *Ideo-motor* principle of action, which consists in the involuntary response made by the muscles to ideas with which the mind may be possessed when the directing power of the will is in abeyance." Assuming this principle, Faraday constructed a machine by which it was demonstrated that the table-turning was the result of the muscular action of the performer.

On unconscious intellection he gives the following statement: "The psychologists of Germany, from the time of Leibnitz, have taught that much of our *mental* work is done *without consciousness*; but this doctrine, though systematically expounded by Sir W. Hamilton under the designation 'Latent Thought,' has only of late attracted the attention of physiologists. Though foreshadowed by Dr. Laycock, in his memoir of 1844 on the 'Reflex Action of the Brain,' it was not expressed with sufficient clearness to obtain recognition on the part of any of those who studied that essay with the care to which its great ability entitles it. Some years afterward, however, Dr. Carpenter was led, by considering the anatomical relation of the Cerebrum to the Sensorium, or centre of consciousness, to the conclusion that *ideational* changes may take place in the cerebrum of which we may be at the time unconscious through a want of receptivity on the part of the sensorium, just as it is unconscious during sleep of the impressions made by visual images on the retina; but that the results of such changes may afterward present themselves to the consciousness as ideas, elaborated by an automatic process of which we have no cognizance. This principle of action was expounded by Dr. Carpenter, under the designation 'Unconscious Cerebration,' in the fourth edition of his 'Human Physiology,' published early in 1853—some months before any of the phenomena developed themselves to the explanation of which we now deem it applicable; and it has been of late frequently referred to under that name. The Lectures of Sir William Hamilton not having then been published, none but his own pupils were aware that the doctrine of 'Unconscious Cerebration' is really the same as that which had long previously been expounded by him as 'Latent Thought;' and the two designations may be regarded as used on the same fundamental principle—one expressing it in terms of Brain, the other in terms of Mind."

The solutions of the *savans* will doubtless cover a large amount of cases; but, perhaps, they are guilty of a very un-unscientific method in regard to a residue of cases, namely, holding those who doubt as simpletons, and supplementing reasoning with ridicule. Our *savan* reasons well to a certain extent, and thereafter substitutes something else besides reasoning which is not quite so good as reasoning. We feel doubtful whether either solutions, namely, unconscious volition, unconscious cerebration, deception, imputations of stupidity, or ridicule, will explain the manifestations in the Wesley family. And starting with one such case, with or without the leave of the savans, we soon find a series of analogous cases, perhaps some furnished by Mr. Owen, in a work noticed on another page, of which their solutions are no solutions.

Mr. Owen gives quite fully the case of Mr. Livermore, one of our New York Fifth Avenue merchant princes. Losing a friend by death, he is induced, though a skeptic, to consult Mrs. Underhill. In one of the apartments of his own residence, by himself selected, with Mrs. Underhill alone, with every means of deception removed, the doors closed and fastened with sealing wax, he holds a series of sessions. Repeatedly, amid phenomena of the most remarkable character, the well-known features and figure of his deceased friend are made visible, for half an hour at a time, radiant with beauty, and messages are received from her. This occurs again and again through a series of years. Admitting the sanity and veracity of Mr. Livermore, our *savan* makes no approach to a solution of the facts.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Pilgrim Fathers. 2. Greek Democracy. 3. Faraday. 4. Geoffrey Chaucer. 5. Bearings of Modern Science on Art. 6. The Authorship of Junius. 7. The Baptists. 8. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. 9. The Session of 1871.

On the narratives of the resurrection of Jesus in the Gospels we have the following striking summary: "For it will be observed that the many particularities and minor traits which occur in their narratives are exactly the product which would arise in an attempt tacitly to meet difficulties and objections. Thus it was currently reported by the Jews that the disciples on the same fundamental principle—one expressing it in terms of Brain, the other in terms of Mind."

The solutions of the savans will doubtless cover a large amount of cases; but, perhaps, they are guilty of a very unscientific method in regard to a residue of cases, namely, holding those who doubt as simpletons, and supplementing reasoning with ridicule. Our savans reason well to a certain extent, and thereafter substitute something else besides reasoning which is not quite so good as reasoning. We feel doubtful whether either solutions, namely, unconscious volition, unconscious cerebration, deception, imputations of stupidity, or ridicule, will explain the manifestations in the Wesley family. And starting with one such case, with or without the leave of the savans, we soon find a series of analogous cases, perhaps some furnished by Mr. Owen, in a work noticed on another page, of which their solutions are no solutions.

Mr. Owen gives quite fully the case of Mr. Livermore, one of our New York Fifth Avenue merchant princes. Losing a friend by death, he is induced, though a skeptic, to consult Mrs. Underhill. In one of the apartments of his own residence, by himself selected, with Mrs. Underhill alone, with every means of deception removed, the doors closed and fastened with sealing wax, he holds a series of sessions. Repeatedly, amid phenomena of the most remarkable character, the well-known features and figure of his deceased friend are made visible, for half an hour at a time, radiant with beauty, and messages are received from her. This occurs again and again through a series of years. Admitting the sanity and veracity of Mr. Livermore, our savans makes no approach to a solution of the facts.

Westminster Review, October 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Religious Future. 2. Greek Democracy. 3. Prussia. 4. Geoffrey Chaucer. 5. Relations of Modern Science to Art. 6. The Authorship of Junius. 7. The Baptists. 8. Scottish Episcopal Leases. 9. The Session of 1871.

On the narratives of the resurrection of Jesus in the Gospels we have the following striking summary: "For it will be observed that the many particularities and minor traits which occur in their narratives are exactly the product which would arise in an attempt merely to meet difficulties and objections. Thus it was currently reported by the Jews that the disciples of Christ removed his body after the crucifixion. No, says the narrative, for it was carefully deposited in a tomb. Matt. xxvii, 65, 66. At all events, continues the objector, the body disappeared. Yes, rejoins the narrative, for the tomb was miraculously opened. Matt. xxviii, 2. But how do we know it was miraculously opened? Because the women saw it empty and were told so by the angels. But what should the women have to do at the tomb? They were going with spices and ointments to do honor to the body. Luke xxiv, 1, 2. But there should be better testimony to such an event than that of imaginative women. Yes, there was the evidence of his disciples, who had known him well. John xx, 20. But they might well imagine a resurrection at sight of the open tomb. Yes, but they saw himself. A few attached friends might fancy an appearance. Yes, but they saw him often. Acts i, 3. Sight is fallacious. But then he was touched and handled. Luke xxiv, 39. Might not then the inference be that he was personated by some other, or that he had been naturally resuscitated? Nay, the print of the wounds was enough to convince the most doubting both of his identity and of his death. John xx, 25–28. At best the story hangs upon the report of a few who might be deceiving or deceived. Not so, for he appeared not only to them repeatedly, but to five hundred brethren at once. 1 Cor. xv, 6. But what became of this resuscitated person. How long did he live, and how did he die again? He did not die again, but was removed from the earth in the very sight of the gazing apostles. Luke xxiv, 51. And thus from the belief in the resurrection as a germ may have grown up naturally the history of the resurrection as its product."

But when we consider the perfectly independent character of each Gospel, as evinced by the discrepancies between them so difficult to reconcile, this remarkable combination of evidencial items could not have been formed by any combined purpose of the writers. It is all spontaneous and humanly accidental; the plain result of an honest, simple narrative by each separate writer of facts as they are here.

of Christ removed his body after the crucifixion. No, says the narrative, for it was carefully deposited in a tomb. Matt. xxvii, 65, 66. At all events, continues the objector, the body disappeared. Yes, rejoins the narrative, for the tomb was miraculously opened. Matt. xxviii, 2. But how do we know it was miraculously opened? Because the women saw it empty and were told so by the angels. But what should the women have to do at the tomb? They were going with spices and ointments to do honor to the body. Luke xxiv, 1, 2. But there should be better testimony to such an event than that of imaginative women. Yes, there was the evidence of his disciples, who had known him well. John xx, 20. But they might well imagine a resurrection at sight of the open tomb. Yes, but they saw himself. A few attached friends might fancy an appearance. Yes, but they saw him often. Acts i, 3. Sight is fallacious. But then he was touched and handled. Luke xxiv, 39. Might not then the informers be that he was personated by some other, or that he had been naturally resuscitated? Nay, the prints of the wounds was enough to convince the most doubting both of his identity and of his death. John xx, 25-28. At last the story hangs upon the report of a few who might be deceivers or deceived. Not so, for he appeared not only to them repeatedly, but to five hundred brethren at once. 1 Cor. xv, 6. But what became of this resuscitated person. How long did he live, and how did he die again? He did not die again, but was removed from the earth in the very sight of the gazing apostles. Luke xxiv, 51. And thus from the belief in the resurrection as a germ may have grown up naturally the history of the resurrection as its product."

But when we consider the perfectly independent character of each Gospel, as evinced by the discrepancies between them so difficult to reconcile, this remarkable combination of evidential items could not have been formed by any concerted purpose of the writers. It is all spontaneous and honestly accidental; the plain result of an honest, simple narrative by each separate writer of facts as they are here.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. Theological Essays and Reviews. First Number, 1872. *Essays:* 1. HOLZ, Researches on the Beginnings of the Christian Liturgy. 2. BRIEGER, (Privatdocent at the University of Halle,) Cardinal Contarini's Doctrine of Justification. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. MAERCKER, Professor in Meiningen, Has Paul been Two times or Three times in Corinth? 2. KÖSTLIN, Luther's Birth Year. *Reviews:* 1. ROMANG, On Important Questions of Religion, reviewed by Saarschmidt, Professor in Bonn. 2. LEIMBACH, On Commodian's Carmen Apologeticum adversus Gentes Judæos, reviewed by Oehler. 3. HUPFELD, The Psalms, reviewed by Biehm.

Dr. Brieger, of the University of Halle, published in 1870 a work on Cardinal Gasparo Contarini, in which he called attention to a particular crisis in the History of the Reformation—the negotiations at Ratisbon in 1541—which for a time seemed to offer a fair prospect for the reunion of the Lutherans with Rome. This work he now follows up by the above article on Contarini, which discusses the relation of the Cardinal to the doctrine of justification as agreed upon in Ratisbon. There is still extant a treatise ("Tractatus seu Epistola de Justificatione,") which the Cardinal, during the days of the Colloquium wrote with regard to, and in defense of, the formula of reunion. In 1571, when the complete works of the Cardinal were published at Paris, the Sorbonne approved of the reception of the treatise into the collection; while a few years later, (1589,) in a new edition published at Venice, it was considerably altered by the Inquisitor-General of Venice, Marco Medici, so as to appear to some extent to be in harmony with the Council of Trent. Later, (in 1748,) the learned Cardinal Angelo Maria Quirini, Bishop of Brescia, and at the same time member of the Berlin Academy of Science, published, in the third volume of his edition of the letters of Pole, the essay of Contarini in its original form, together with the changes of the Venitian edition. This publication involved Quirini in a long controversy with the Leipsic Professor Kiesling, who victoriously refuted the attempt of Quirini to prove the (Roman Catholic) orthodoxy of Contarini. That in this controversy Kiesling was right and Quirini wrong, has in particular been recognized by Döllinger in his great work on the Reformation.

Some Protestant theologians have, however, been of opinion that while the views of Contarini were certainly not those of the Roman Catholic Church, they neither agree wholly with the opinions of the Protestant theologians. Dr. Brieger enters

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) First Number, 1873. *Essays*: 1. RIEHM, Researches on the [illegible] of the Christian Liturgy. 2. BRIEGER, Contributions to the [illegible]. Cardinal Contarini's Doctrine of Justification. *Thoughts and Remarks*: 1. [illegible] Prophecies in [illegible]. 2. KÖSTLIN, Luther's [illegible]. [illegible] On [illegible] Questions of Religion, reviewed by [illegible]. 2. [illegible] On Commodian's Carmen Apologeticum [illegible] reviewed by Oehler. 5. [illegible] reviewed by [illegible].

Dr. Brieger, of the University of Halle, published in 1870 a work on Cardinal Gasparo Contarini, in which he called attention to a particular crisis in the History of the Reformation—the negotiations at Ratisbon in 1541—which for a time seemed to offer a fair prospect for the reunion of the Lutherans with Rome. This work he now follows up by the above article on Contarini, which discusses the relation of the Cardinal to the doctrine of justification as agreed upon in Ratisbon. There is still extant a treatise ("Tractatus seu Epistola de Justificatione,") which the Cardinal, during the days of the Colloquium wrote with regard to, and in defense of, the formula of reunion. In 1571, when the complete works of the Cardinal were published at Paris, the Sorbonne approved of the reception of the treatise into the collection; while a few years later (1589,) in a new edition published at Venice, it was considerably altered by the Inquisitor-General of Venice, Marco Medici, so as to appear to some extent to be in harmony with the Council of Trent. Later, (in 1748,) the learned Cardinal Angelo Maria Quirini, Bishop of Brescia, and at the same time member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, published, in the third volume of his edition of the letters of Pole, the essay of Contarini in its original form, together with the changes of the Venetian edition. This publication involved Quirini in a long controversy with the Leipsic Professor Kiesling, who vigorously refuted the attempt of Quirini to prove the (Roman Catholic) orthodoxy of Contarini. That in this controversy Kiesling was right and Quirini wrong, has in particular been recognized by Döllinger in his great work on the Reformation.

Some Protestant theologians have, however, been of opinion that while the views of Contarini were certainly not those of the Roman Catholic Church, they neither agree wholly with the opinions of the Protestant theologians. Dr. Brieger shows into a minute discussion of this question, and finally reaches the conclusion, that while the Cardinal in the expressions he used made some concessions, the substance of his essay is thoroughly Protestant and Evangelical. As an appendix to this essay, Dr. Brieger publishes the full text of a letter from Contarini to Cardinal Alexander Farnese, a nephew of the Pope, who had informed Contarini that it was rumored at Rome that the representatives of the Church in the Ratisbon Conference had made too great concessions to the Protestants, in particular in the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) 1872. First Number.—1. HILGENFELD, The Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. KLUGE, Remarks on Holtzmann's Article: The Readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 3. HÖNIG, On the Relation of the Epistle to the Ephesians to that to the Colossians. 4. HILGENFELD, On Keim's Life of Jesus. 5. SPIEGEL, The Tenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg.

In the First Article Professor Hilgenfeld again discusses, with special regard to the whole recent literature on the subject, the questions as to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the time of its composition, its original readers, and its theological tenets. In common with Luther, Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, Bunsen, Lünemann, Kurtz, and other noted theological writers, he adheres to the opinion that the Epistle was written by Apollos to Christian Hebrews at Alexandria before the outbreak of the bloody persecutions of the Alexandrian Jews in A.D. 66.

In the Fourth Article Hilgenfeld reviews at length the new volume (Part II, Volume II) of the Life of Jesus by Professor Theodor Keim, of Zurich, which is entitled "Galilean Tempests." Though Hilgenfeld belongs to the same critical and rationalistic school as Keim, his notice of the work is by no means favorable. But the majority of the theologians of this school appear to have a very high opinion of Keim's book. Thus, in Schenkel's "Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift," Professor Hausrath, of Heidelberg, calls it a work which constitutes a turning point; which is the most important scientific production on this subject, with which no other work can vie as regards extent of learning and mature consideration of all circumstances; which has collected with marvelous erudition the whole gigantic amount of exegetical material, and clearly distinguished between what is essential and unessential. The into a minute discussion of this question, and finally reaches the conclusion, that while the Cardinal in the expressions he used made some concessions, the substance of his essay is thoroughly Protestant and Evangelical. As an appendix to this essay, Dr. Brieger publishes the full text of a letter from Contarini to Cardinal Alexander Farnese, a nephew of the Pope, who had informed Contarini that it was rumored at Rome that the representatives of the Church in the Ratisbon Conference had made too great concessions to the Protestants, in particular in the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (*Journal for Scientific Theology.*) 1873. *First Number.*—1. HILGENFELD, The Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. KÄHNE, Remarks on Holtzmann's Article: The Readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 3. HÖNIG, On the Relation of the Epistle to the Ephesians to that to the Colossians. 4. HILGENFELD, On Keim's Life of Jesus. 5. SCHMIDT, The Tenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg.

In the First Article Professor Hilgenfeld again discusses, with special regard to the whole recent literature on the subject, the questions as to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the time of its composition, its original readers, and its theological tenets. In common with Luther, Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, Bunsen, Lünemann, Kurtz, and other noted theological writers, he adheres to the opinion that the Epistle was written by Apollos to Christian Hebrews at Alexandria before the outbreak of the bloody persecutions of the Alexandrian Jews in A. D. 66.

In the Fourth Article Hilgenfeld reviews at length the new volume (Part II, Volume II) of the Life of Jesus by Professor Theodor Keim, of Zurich, which is entitled "Galilean Tempests." Though Hilgenfeld belongs to the same critical and rationalistic school as Keim, his notice of the work is by no means favorable. But the majority of the theologians of this school appear to have a very high opinion of Keim's book. Thus, in Schenkel's "Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift," Professor Hausrath, of Heidelberg, calls it a work which constitutes a turning point; which is the most important scientific production on this subject, with which no other work can vie as regards extent of learning and mature consideration of all circumstances; which has collected with marvelous erudition the whole gigantic amount of exegetical material, and clearly distinguished between what is essential and unessential. The editor of the "Zeitschrift," Professor Schenkel, declares that he agrees with his colleague, Hausrath, in recognizing the rare excellency of the work of Keim, although he differs from some of its views, as he expects to explain more fully in a subsequent number of his periodical.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH.—The General Congress of the Old Catholics was held in Munich on September 22d and the two following days, and, as was expected, it led to the organization of the Old Catholics as a Church independent of Rome. The Congress was composed of about three hundred delegates, representing all parts of Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Switzerland. There were also several representatives of the so-called Jansenists for Holland—a small Church organization with an Archbishop at Utrecht and two Bishops, who for nearly two hundred years have maintained, in spite of all Papal excommunications, an independent Catholic Church organization on the same basis on which now the Old Catholics plant themselves. From France, Father Hyacinthe was present, who, from the beginning of the movement, has shown himself one of its most ardent supporters. The Holy Synod of St. Petersburg had sent one of the foremost theological scholars of the country, Professor Ossinin, and authorized him, in case the resolutions of the Congress should be in harmony with the doctrines of the Greek Church, to enter into negotiations for a closer union. The Spanish Government had sent a delegate, and instructed him to watch the proceedings. Several other countries were likewise represented by a few delegates. Professor Schulte, of the University of Prague, whom the Roman Catholics before 1870 regarded as their ablest writer on Church law and on all questions touching the relation between Church and State, was elected president. As vice-presidents the Congress elected Dr. Windscheid, of Heidelberg, and Augustin Keller, a prominent statesman of Switzerland, who has been president of his canton, Aargau, and is now president of the upper branch of the Federal Legislature. The resolutions which were to be the subject of the deliberations of the Congress had been drafted by a Committee consisting of seven of the most prominent scholars of Catholic Germany, namely, Dr. Döllinger, Professor Huber, and Professor Friedrich, of the University of Munich, Professor Reinkens, of the University of Breslau, Professor Schulte, of the University of Prague, Professor Langen, of the University of Bonn, and Professor Massen, of the University of Gratz. Four members of the Committee, Döllinger, Reinkens, Langen, and Friedrich, are priests; the other three laymen. Massen is a convert from Protestantism. The first two resolutions submitted by the Committee were adopted unanimously and without opposition. They are as follows:

editor of the "*Zeitschrift*," Professor Schenkel, declares that he agrees with his colleagues, Hausrath, in recognizing the rare excellency of the work of Keim, although he differs from some of its views, as he expects to explain more fully in a subsequent number of his periodical.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CONGRESS.—The General Congress of the Old Catholics was held in Munich on September 22d and the two following days, and, as was expected, it led to the organization of the Old Catholics as a Church independent of Rome. The Congress was composed of about three hundred delegates, representing all parts of Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Switzerland. There were also several representatives of the so-called Jansenists for Holland—a small Church organization with an Archbishop at Utrecht and two Bishops, who for nearly two hundred years have maintained, in spite of all Papal excommunications, an independent Catholic Church organization on the same basis on which now the Old Catholics plant themselves. From France, Father Hyacinthe was present, who, from the beginning of the movement, has shown himself one of its most ardent supporters. The Holy Synod of St. Petersburg had sent one of the foremost theological scholars of the country, Professor Ossinin, and authorized him, in case the resolutions of the Congress should be in harmony with the doctrines of the Greek Church, to enter into negotiations for a closer union. The Spanish Government had sent a delegate, and instructed him to watch the proceedings. Several other countries were likewise represented by a few delegates. Professor Schulte, of the University of Prague, whom the Roman Catholics before 1870 regarded as their ablest writer on Church law and on all questions touching the relation between Church and State, was elected president. As vice-presidents the Congress elected Dr. Windscheid, of Heidelberg, and Augustin Keller, a prominent statesman of Switzerland, who has been president of his canton, Aargau, and is now president of the upper branch of the Federal Legislature. The resolutions which were to be the subject of the deliberations of the Congress had been drafted by a Committee consisting of some of the most prominent scholars of Catholic Germany, namely, Dr. Döllinger, Professor Huber, and Professor Friedrich, of the University of Munich, Professor Reinkens, of the University of Breslau, Professor Schulte, of the University of Prague, Professor Langen, of the University of Bonn, and Professor Maassen, of the University of Gratz. Four members of the Committee, Döllinger, Reinkens, Langen, and Friedrich, are priests; the other three laymen. Maassen is a convert from Protestantism. The first two resolutions submitted by the Committee were adopted unanimously and without opposition. They are as follows:

1. Conscious of our religious duties, we hold fast to the Old Catholic Faith, as it is laid down in the Scriptures and in tradition. We therefore regard ourselves as full members of the Catholic Church, and do not permit ourselves to be dislodged either from the communion of the Church or from the ecclesiastical and civil rights which we derive from this communion. We regard the ecclesiastical censures which have been pronounced against us on account of our fidelity to our faith as vain and arbitrary, and we are not troubled by them in our consciences, and not prevented by them from the exercise of our ecclesiastical communion. From the stand-point of the Confession of Faith, as it is still contained in the so-called Tridentine Symbol, we reject the doctrines which, in opposition to the doctrines of the Church and to the principles adopted from the times of the Apostolical Council, have been framed during the pontificate of Pius IX., in particular the doctrine of Papal infallibility and of the supreme, ordinary, and immediate jurisdiction of the Pope.

2. We hold fast to the old constitution of the Church. We reject every attempt to force the Bishops out of the immediate and independent administration of the individual Churches. We reject the doctrine contained in the Vatican Decrees, that the Pope is the only divinely instituted bearer of all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction, as being in opposition to the Tridentine Canon, according to which there exists a divinely instituted hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons. We recognize the primacy of the Roman Bishops, as it was recognized by the Fathers and Councils in the old undivided Christian Church on the basis of the Scriptures. (*a*) We declare that doctrines of faith are defined, not merely by the decision of an individual Pope and of the Bishops who by an oath are bound to an unconditional obedience to the Pope, but only in harmony with the holy Scriptures and the old ecclesiastical tradition, as it is laid down in the recognized Fathers and Councils. Even a Council which would not lack, like that of the Vatican, essential external conditions of œcumenicity, and which, with a unanimous consent of its members, would break loose from the basis and past of the Church, could promulgate no decrees which would be obligatory for the conscience of the Church members. (*b*) We emphatically declare that the doctrinal decisions of a Council must show themselves in the immediate doctrinal consciousness of the Catholic people and in theological science, as agreeing with the original and traditional faith of the Church. We claim for the definition of the rules of faith for the Catholic laity and clergy, as well as for scientific theology, the right of witnessing and of protesting.

On the third paragraph, which speaks of the relation of the Old Catholics to the Jansenists and the Greek Church, a long discussion arose, in which the delegate of the Russian Church, Professor Ossinin, of St. Petersburg, and nearly all the prominent leaders of the Congress took part. After the adoption of several amendments it was finally approved by the Congress in the following shape:

3. We aim, under the co-operation of the theological and canonistical science, at a reformation of the Church, which, in the spirit of the Old

Church, shall remove the present faults and abuses; which in particular shall fulfill the just wishes of the Catholic people for constitutional participation in Church affairs; and at which the national views and wants of the Catholic people shall be taken into consideration as far as it is compatible with the ecclesiastical unity of doctrine. We declare that the reproach of Jansenism has wrongly been made against the Church of Utrecht, and that consequently there exists no difference between her and us. We hope for a reunion with the Greek-Oriental and the Russian Church, the separation of which took place without stringent causes, and is not grounded in any insolvable dogmatical difference. We expect, on the supposition of the aimed-at reformation, and in the way of science and progressive culture, a gradual understanding with the Protestant and the Episcopal Churches.

The discussion of the fourth paragraph showed a considerable difference of opinion with regard to the influence which the State Government may claim upon the education of the Catholic clergy. The Congress finally adopted the paragraph as follows:

4. We regard the cultivation of science as indispensable in the education of the Catholic clergy. We regard the artificial seclusion of the clergy from the intellectual culture of the century in the *seminaria puerorum* and in higher institutions, under the one-sided control of the bishops, to be dangerous and entirely inappropriate for training and educating a moral, pious, scientifically-educated, and patriotic clergy. We demand for the so-called lower clergy a worthy position, which will protect them from hierarchical arbitrariness. In particular do we reject the arbitrary removability, (*amovibilitas ad nutum*) of the parish priests, which has been introduced by the French law, and the introduction of which is now more generally aimed at.

The last three paragraphs called forth but little discussion; they are substantially as follows:

5. We adhere to the constitutions of our countries, which guarantee civil liberty and humanitarian culture, and we therefore reject, from considerations of political economy and civilization, the dangerous doctrine of Papal omnipotence; and we declare that we will truly and steadfastly support our governments in the conflict with Ultamontanism, as defined in the Syllabus.

6. Since the present fatal disorder in the Catholic Church has been caused by the so-called Society of Jesus—since this order abuses its power for the purpose of spreading and nourishing anti-national tendencies which are hostile to civilization and dangerous to the State—since it teaches a false and corrupting morality—we express the conviction that peace and prosperity, harmony in the Church, and a correct understanding between her and civil society cannot be expected until an end shall be made to the injurious activity of this order.

7. As members of the Catholic Church which was not yet altered by the Vatican Decrees, and to which the States have guaranteed political recog-

Church, shall remove the present faults and abuses; which in particular shall fulfil the just wishes of the Catholic people for constitutional participation in Church affairs; and at which the national views and wants of the Catholic people shall be taken into consideration, as far as it is compatible with the ecclesiastical unity of doctrines. We declare that the reproach of Jansenism has wrongly been made against the Church of Utrecht, and that consequently there exists no difference between her and us. We hope for a reunion with the Greek-Oriental and the Russian Church, the separation of which took place without sufficient causes, and is not grounded in any insolvable dogmatical difference. We expect, on the basis of the aimed-at reformation, and in the way of science and progressive culture, a gradual understanding with the Protestant and the Episcopal Churches.

The discussion of the fourth paragraph showed a considerable difference of opinion with regard to the influence which the State Governments may claim upon the education of the Catholic clergy. The Congress finally adopted the paragraph as follows:

4. We regard the cultivation of science as indispensable in the education of the Catholic clergy. We regard the artificial seclusion of the clergy from the intellectual culture of the century in the seminaries, gymnasia, and in higher institutions, under the one-sided control of the bishops, to be dangerous and entirely inappropriate for training and educating a moral, pious, scientifically educated, and patriotic clergy. We claim also for the so-called lower clergy a worthy position, which will protect them from hierarchical arbitrariness. In particular do we reject the arbitrary removability, (amovibilitas ad nutum) of the parish priests, which has been introduced by the French law, and the introduction of which is now more generally aimed at.

The last three paragraphs called forth but little discussion; they are substantially as follows:

5. We adhere to the constitutions of our countries, which guarantee civil liberty and humanitarian culture, and we therefore reject, from considerations of political economy and civilization, the dangerous doctrine of Papal omnipotence; and we declare that we will truly and manfully support our governments in the conflict with Ultramontanism, as defined in the Syllabus.

6. Since the present fatal disorder in the Catholic Church has been caused by the so-called Society of Jesus—since this order abuses its power for the purpose of spreading and nourishing anti-national tendencies which are hostile to civilization and dangerous to the State—since it teaches a false and corrupting morality—we express the conviction that peace and prosperity, harmony in the Church, and a correct understanding between her and civil society cannot be expected until an end shall be made to the injurious activity of this order.

7. As members of the Catholic Church which was not yet altered by the Vatican Decrees, and to which the States have guaranteed political recog-

nition and public protection, we maintain our claims to all real possessions and titles of the Church.

Besides the adoption of the doctrinal platform, the task of the Congress included the important question of a permanent organization. There was an almost entire unanimity as to the necessity to organize the Old Catholic movement all over the world; and the Congress without debate, and almost unanimously, adopted a resolution moved by Dr. Zirngrell, to appoint a Standing Committee, with the right of unlimited co-operation, for the purpose of carrying through an organized Catholic movement. This Committee consists of the officers of the Congress and the President of the Munich Committee. An important discussion arose on the formation of Old Catholic congregations. On this point Dr. Döllinger, to the great surprise of many, showed himself timid and irresolute. He admonished the Congress to proceed in this direction with the utmost caution. The exceptional condition in which the faithful Catholics at present find themselves gives them certain rights, but they proceed beyond these rights. He therefore desired that a resolution, moved by the President of the Congress, Professor Schulte, which provides for the organization of the Old Catholic Church, be referred to a Special Committee. Döllinger, it seems, wished the Old Catholics to remain strictly within the bounds of a protest against the obligatory character of the Vatican Council, hoping that in due time, under the guidance of Providence, the Church would be delivered from these Papal corruptions. But highly as Dr. Dollinger is esteemed among the Old Catholics, he found hardly any supporters of this view. All the other speakers were very outspoken in advocating the resolution of Professor Schulte. They argued that the religious wants of the Catholics against whom the Papal hierarchy had launched the ecclesiastical censures were so urgent that a provisional re-establishment of the ecclesiastical organization could not be avoided, and that it was their duty to carry out practically what theoretically they had laid down in the programme. The resolution was then almost unanimously adopted by the Congress.

From the adoption of this resolution dates the actual origin of the Old Catholic Church. It has since made sure headway, especially in Bavaria, where there were in November one hundred and fourteen Old Catholic congregations, with church property worth a million of dollars. There are between seventy and eighty Old Catholic congregations in the Prussian provinces of Posen and Silesia, while the number in Westphalia and the Rhine provinces can hardly be less. In Baden twenty-nine Old Catholic congregations are in full operation, and seven are reported in Würtemberg. In Austria, too, including the Tyrol, the movement is active. Four Old Catholic organizations have been organized in Prague, and seven in Vienna. In Hungary the Old Catholics are very numerous, and many of the Bishops are believed to be in sympathy with them. In France and Belgium, owing to the indifference of the higher classes to religion, little is to be heard of the question, although Father Hyacinthe is actively preaching the reform; but quite a number of old Catholic congregations have sprung up in Holland.

sition and public profession, we maintain our claims to all real possessions and titles of the Church.

Besides the adoption of the doctrinal platform, the task of the Congress included the important question of a permanent organization. There was an almost entire unanimity as to the necessity to organize the Old Catholic movement all over the world; and the Congress, without debate, and almost unanimously, adopted a resolution moved by Dr. Maassen, to appoint a Standing Committee, with the right of unlimited co-optation, for the purpose of carrying through an organized Catholic movement. This Committee consists of the officers of the Congress and the President of the Munich Committee. An important discussion arose on the formation of Old Catholic congregations. On this point Dr. Döllinger, to the great surprise of many, showed himself timid and irresolute. He admonished the Congress to proceed in this direction with the utmost caution. The exceptional condition in which the faithful Catholics at present find themselves gives them certain rights, but they proceed beyond these rights. He therefore desired that a resolution, moved by the President of the Congress, Professor Schulte, which provides for the organization of the Old Catholic Church, be referred to a Special Committee. Döllinger, it seems, wished the Old Catholics to remain strictly within the bounds of a protest against the obligatory character of the Vatican Council, hoping that in due time, under the guidance of Providence, the Church would be delivered from these Papal corruptions. But highly as Dr. Döllinger is esteemed among the Old Catholics, he found hardly any supporters of this view. All the other speakers were very outspoken in advocating the resolution of Professor Schulte. They argued that the religious wants of the Catholics against whom the Papal hierarchy had launched the ecclesiastical censures were so urgent that a provisional re-establishment of the ecclesiastical organization could not be avoided, and that it was their duty to carry out practically what theoretically they had laid down in the programme. The resolution was then almost unanimously adopted by the Congress.

From the adoption of this resolution dates the actual origin of the Old Catholic Church. It has since made some headway, especially in Bavaria, where there were in November one hundred and fourteen Old Catholic congregations, with church property worth a million of dollars. There are between seventy and eighty Old Catholic congregations in the Prussian provinces of Posen and Silesia, while the number in Westphalia and the Rhine provinces can hardly be less. In Baden twenty-nine Old Catholic congregations are in full operation, and seven are reported in Würtemberg. In Austria, too, including the Tyrol, the movement is active. Four Old Catholic organizations have been organized in Prague, and eight in Vienna. In Hungary the Old Catholics are very numerous, and many of the Bishops are believed to be in sympathy with them. In France and Belgium, owing to the indifference of the higher classes to religion, little is to be heard of the question, although Father Hyacinthe is actively preaching the reform; but quite a number of Old Catholic congregations have sprung up in Holland.

An important attitude with regard to the Old Catholic movement has been taken by the Government of Bavaria. In reply to certain demands made by the Bavarian Bishops, the Minister of Public Worship, Herr Von Lutz, (in a letter dated August 27,) announces that the Government will refuse all co-operation for spreading the new doctrines of the Vatican Council, and for executing episcopal decrees; and in reply to an interpellation in the Bavarian Chamber of Deputies, the same Minister declared that the Government will adhere to the principle that the measures which the Bishops may adopt against the Old Catholics must not have any influence upon the political and civil condition of those censured; that the congregations which may be formed by the Old Catholics and their priests shall possess the same rights which they would have had if the congregations had been formed prior to July 18, 1870; and it desires, in the way of legislation, to secure the earliest independence of the State as well as the Church. The Government of Hungary has forbidden the proclamation of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, and has reprimanded one Bishop who officially had communicated the doctrine to his diocesans. The Government of Prussia also continues to protect the Old Catholic professors and clergymen in the full possession of their rights, and the Emperor has severely rebuked the Bishops of his dominions, who in a joint protest had complained of the neutral attitude of the Government, regarding it as a persecution of the Catholic Church.

In view of the number of congregations which have been organized, and the favorable attitude of the Governments toward the Old Catholics, it appears a little remarkable that up to December, 1871, no step had been taken toward organizing Old Catholic dioceses and electing Old Catholic Bishops. It is reported that an Old Catholic pastor of Bavaria, who with almost his entire congregation has declared against the Vatican Council, has applied to the (Jansenist) Archbishop of Utrecht, in Holland, for the administration of the sacrament of confirmation in his congregation, and that the Archbishop has made the compliance with the request dependent upon two conditions; first, that the Bavarian congregation must previously apply to its own diocesan Bishop, and, secondly, that it must adhere to all the decrees of the Tridentine Council. On the whole, the leaders of the Old Catholic movement appear as yet to shrink from progressing to the organization of dioceses.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The number of religious periodicals of Germany has received an addition by the establishment of a new monthly, entitled, *Deutsche Blaetter*, and edited by Dr. G. Füllner, which will discuss, from the stand-point of evangelical Christianity, all the great political, religious, and social questions of our age. The labor question in particular, which raises so great

fears for the future of the European states, will receive prominent attention. Its satisfactory solution, says the editor, will be wholly dependent on the Christian spirit of both the employers and the *employés.* Only if both will be penetrated by the spirit of Christ, in order to act toward each other with love and candor, can the labor question cease to be the greatest danger which threatens our present society.

In view of the importance which the Old Catholic movement is gaining, a work on the life of the late Professor Leopold Schmid, of the University of Giessen, who was elected Bishop of Mentz, but not confirmed by the Pope, gains a special interest. Three Protestant scholars have united for the publication of such a work. (*Leopold Schmid's Leben und Denken.* 1871.) Professor Nippold, in Heidelberg, gives a brief survey of the Old Catholic movement, of which Schmid was one of the most distinguished forerunners. Schröder gives a biographical sketch, and Schwartz an outline of his views.

The Bible-work of Lange, which the translation by Dr. Schaff has made known in the United States even more widely than it is in its native country, has now been completed, so far as the New Testament is concerned, by the publication of the Commentary on the Apocalypse. (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes.* Bielefeld, 1871.) This volume has been compiled by Professor Lange himself.

An interesting essay on the relation of the Gnostic system of Valentinian to the New Testament has been published by G. Heinrici. (*Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die heil. Schrift.* Berlin, 1871.) The question has of late been much discussed. Baur, the head of the Tubingen school, found traces of direct Gnostic influence, and in particular of the system of Valentinian, in the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and Hilgenfeld makes the same assertion with regard to the gospel of John and the minor Pauline epistles. The author undertakes to refute these views, and to prove that where there are points of agreement between parts of the New Testament and the earlier Gnostics they are owing to the circumstance that the latter were acquainted with the books of the New Testament.

The rules which were adopted by the Council of Trent for the management of its deliberations have recently been published for the first time, (*Die Geschäftsordnung des Concils von Trient.* Vienna, 1871,) from a copy of the Vatican archives. The preface discusses the importance which this publication has for Church history. It maintains that the Papal Court has on purpose prevented the publication of this document, because it must become evident from it that the order of business adopted by the Vatican Council was in direct opposition to the synodal traditions of the Church; that it excluded that liberty of discussion which was still regarded by the Council of Trent as an essential right of every Church Council; and that the so-called Vatican Council altogether lacked those attributes of an œcumenical character which are demanded by the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church.

Among the recent Protestant works on the queston of Papal iinfallibility a lecture by Professor Hinschius, a distinguished writer on Church law, fears for the future of the European states will receive a prominent attention. Its satisfactory solution, says the author, will be chiefly dependent on the Christian spirit of both the employers and the employed. Only if both will be penetrated by the spirit of Christ, in order to act toward each other with love and candor, can the labor question cease to be the greatest danger which threatens our present society.

In view of the importance which the Old Catholic movement is assuming, a work on the life of the late Professor Leopold Schmid, of the University of Giessen, who was elected Bishop of Mentz, but not confirmed by the Pope, gains a special interest. Three Protestant scholars have united in the publication of such a work. (*Leopold Schmid's Leben und Denken.* 1871.) Professor Nippold, in Heidelberg, gives a brief survey of the Old Catholic movement, of which Schmid was one of the most distinguished forerunners. Schröder gives a biographical sketch, and Schwarz an outline of his views.

The Bible-work of Lange, which the translation by Dr. Schaff has made known in the United States even more widely than it is in its native country, has now been completed, so far as the New Testament is concerned, by the publication of the commentary on the Apocalypse. (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes.* Bielefeld, 1871.) This volume has been compiled by Professor Lange himself.

An interesting essay on the relation of the Gnostic systems of Valentinus to the New Testament has been published by G. Heinrici. (*Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die heil. Schrift.* Berlin, 1871.) The question has of late been much discussed. Baur, the head of the Tübingen school, found traces of direct Gnostic influence, and in particular of the system of Valentinus, in the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and Hilgenfeld makes the same assertion with regard to the gospel of John and the minor Pauline epistles. The author undertakes to refute these views, and to prove that where there are points of agreement between works of the New Testament and the earlier Gnostics they are owing to the circumstance that the latter were acquainted with the books of the New Testament.

The rules which were adopted by the Council of Trent for the management of its deliberations have recently been published for the first time, (*Die Geschäftsordnung des Concils von Trient.* Vienna, 1871,) from a copy of the Vatican archives. The preface discusses the importance which this publication has for Church history. It maintains that the Papal Curia has on purpose prevented the publication of this document, because it would become evident from it that the order of business adopted by the Vatican Council was in direct opposition to the ancient traditions of the Church; that it excluded that liberty of discussion which was still regarded by the Council of Trent as an essential right of every Church Council; and that the so-called Vatican Council therefore lacked those attributes of an ecumenical character which are demanded by the traditions of the Catholic Church.

Among the recent Protestant works on the question of Papal Infallibility is a lecture by Professor Hundeshagen, a distinguished writer on Church deserves special mention. (*Die päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit und das vatikanische Concil.* Kiel, 1871.) In terse and convincing language it sets forth the historical arguments against the new doctrine, and shows that it must lead to serious conflicts between Church and State.

Professor Oscar Peschel, in Leipsic, has published an interesting lecture on the Division of the Earth under Pope Alexander VI and Julius II. (*Die Theilung der Erde unter Papst Alexander VI und Julius II.* Leipzig, 1871.) As an appendix to the lecture the author gives the two bulls of Alexander of May 3, 4, 1493, and the treaty of Tordesillas of June 7, 1494, which was subsequently confirmed by Pope Julius II, and by which Spain and Portugal agreed upon the line which divided the new world between them. The republication of these documents is opportune, when the infallibility of all the Popes who ever lived has been promulgated as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

All Biblical scholars will feel interested in the pamphlet in which Professor Tischendorf, of Leipsic, gives an account of the discovery and the publication of the Sinaitic manuscript. (*Die Sinaibibel. Ihre Entdeckung, Herausgabe, und Erwerbung.* Leipzig, 1871.) During his first journey in the East, in May, 1844, he discovered in the Convent of St. Catherine, on the Mount of Moses, one hundred and twenty-nine leaves, of which forty-three were ceded to him, and published in 1846, under the name Codex Friderico-Augustanus. Another fragment, which Tischendorf had copied in 1844, he published in 1834, in the first volume of the *Monumenta.* During his third journey in the East, in 1859, he found three hundred and forty-six more leaves, which appears to be all that is extant, the first part of the Codex, comprising about two hundred and seventy leaves, being lost. Tischendorf was authorized to take it to St. Petersburg. His recommendation to present the Russian Emperor with the Codex was complied with by the monks in 1868. The Codex was published in honor of the one thousandth anniversary of the Russian monarchy, at the expense of the Russian Government, Tischendorf having previously (1860) announced it in the *Notitia Codicis Sinaitici.* The expenses of publication amounted to over twenty thousand thalers. Most of the three hundred copies which were printed were presented by the Emperor to princes and large libraries; seventy copies were given to the book trade, all of which, with the exception of six, have now been sold, (at two hundred thalers each.) Tischendorf speaks at length of the attacks made by the well-known forger, Simonides, who pretended to have written the Codex himself, upon the authenticity of the Codex and the objections made by the Archimandrite Porfiri Uspenski against its orthodoxy, on account of the omission of a number of verses. In conclusion, Tischendorf again undertakes to prove that the Codex was written about the middle of the fourth century. The first one contains a specimen of the printed edition, and the second several lithographic fac similes.

deserves special mention. (*Die päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit und das vatikanische Concil.* Kiel, 1873.) In terse and convincing language the author gives the historical arguments against the new doctrine, and shows that it must lead to serious conflicts between Church and State.

Professor Oscar Peschel, in Leipsic, has published an interesting lecture on the Division of the Earth under Pope Alexander VI and Julius II. (*Die Theilung der Erde unter Papst Alexander VI und Julius II.* Leipsic, 1871.) As an appendix to the lecture the author gives the two bulls of Alexander of May 3, 4, 1493, and the treaty of Tordesillas of June 7, 1494, which was subsequently confirmed by Pope Julius II, and by which Spain and Portugal agreed upon the line which divided the new world between them. The republication of these documents is opportune, when the infallibility of all the Popes who ever lived has been promulgated as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

All Biblical scholars will feel interested in the pamphlet in which Professor Tischendorf, of Leipsic, gives an account of the discovery and the publication of the Sinaitic manuscript. (*Die Sinaibibel. Ihre Entdeckung, Herausgabe, und Erwerbung.* Leipsic, 1871.) During his first journey to the East, in May, 1844, he discovered in the Convent of St. Catharine, on the Mount of Moses, one hundred and twenty-nine leaves, of which forty-three were ceded to him, and published in 1846, under the name of *Codex Friderico-Augustanus*. Another fragment, which Tischendorf transcribed in 1844, he published in 1855, in the first volume of the *Monumenta*. During his third journey to the East, in 1859, he found three hundred and forty-six more leaves, which appears to be all that is extant, the first part of the Codex, comprising about two hundred and sixty [illegible]. Tischendorf was authorized to take it to St. Petersburg. He recommended the monks to present the Russian Emperor with the Codex, [illegible] by the monks in 1869. The Codex was published in honor of the one thousandth anniversary of the Russian monarchy, at the expense of the Russian Government, Tischendorf having previously (1860) announced it in the *Notitia Codicis Sinaitici*. The expenses of publication amounted to over twenty thousand thalers. Most of the three hundred copies which were printed were presented by the Emperor to princes and large libraries; seventy copies were given to the book trade, all of which, with the exception of six, have now been sold, (at two hundred thalers each.) Tischendorf speaks at length of the attacks made by the well-known forger, Simonides, who pretended to have written the Codex himself, upon the authenticity of the Codex, and the objections made by the Archimandrite Porfiri Uspenski against its orthodoxy, on account of the opinions of a number of critics. In conclusion, Tischendorf again endeavors to prove that the Codex was written about the middle of the fourth century. The first one contains a specimen of the printed edition, and the second several lithographic facsimiles.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Revelation of John. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, Designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D.D. 12mo., pp. 254. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

Professor Cowles has published several volumes of commentary, in manual form, which may be safely recommended for popular use. They make little display of erudition; the style is plain, and sometimes diffuse; the doctrines, so far as we have observed, are evangelical, and the sentiments devout and practical. The present commentary, without surrender of the author's independence, coincides to a great degree with that of Professor Stuart; it maintains the earlier date of the Apocalypse, identifies the beast that was slain, to live again, not, as Stuart, with Nero, but with Julius Cæsar, and sustains the antichiliastic view of the twentieth chapter. The untenable, and dangerous if not untenable, character of the Neronian explication we have specified in our note on the "Lutheran Quarterly."

Professor Cowles reproduces here from his Commentary on Daniel his essay in disproof of "the day-year theory" of prophecy. His argument is essentially identical with that of Professor Stuart, and, from the pen of both professors, it appears to us to be alike a failure. The failure in both cases seems to arise from the same cause, namely, from their being unaware of the true basis of the day-year theory, which we take to be as follows:

When a nation is symbolized by an animal, and the life of the nation is predicted as to endure for centuries, how are those centuries to be symbolized? To represent the beast as to live twelve hundred and sixty years, for instance, would be a monstrosity. Symmetry requires that the period should be reduced to a time-symbol correspondent to the animal-symbol. But this time-period can properly be symbolized only by a time-period. In Pharaoh's dream years were indeed symbolized by ears of corn and by kine; but such symbols cannot well express time as the attribute of an animal-symbol already produced. The only method left is to represent the duration of the nation's life by a time symbol suitable to an animal's life, as a *year* by a *day*. This understood, Professor Cowles's entire argument evaporates.

"The word *lion*," he tells us, even in symbolical prophecy, "means *lion*, and *bear* means *bear*;" and so day must mean *day* and not *year*. Very true. As the word *lion* means *lion*, so *day*

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Revelation of John. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical. Designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D.D. 12mo., pp. 254. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

Professor Cowles has published several volumes of commentary, in manual form, which may be safely commended for popular use. They make little display of erudition; the style is plain, and sometimes diffuse; the doctrines, so far as we have observed, are evangelical, and the sentiments devout and practical. The present commentary, without surrender of the author's independence, coincides to a great degree with that of Professor Stuart; it maintains the earlier date of the Apocalypse, identifies the beast that was slain, to live again, not, as Stuart, with Nero, but with Julius Cesar, and sustains the antimillennial view of the twentieth chapter. The untenable, and dangerous if not untenable, character of the Neronian explication we have specified in our note on the "Lutheran Quarterly."

Professor Cowles reproduces here from his Commentary on Daniel his essay in disproof of "the day-year theory" of prophecy. His argument is essentially identical with that of Professor Stuart, and, from the pen of both professors, it appears to us to be alike a failure. The failure in both cases seems to arise from the same cause, namely, from their being unaware of the true basis of the day-year theory, which we take to be as follows:

When a nation is symbolized by an animal, and the life of the nation is predicted as to endure for centuries, how are those centuries to be symbolized? To represent the beast as to live twelve hundred and sixty years, for instance, would be a monstrosity. Symmetry requires that the period should be reduced to a time-symbol correspondent to the animal-symbol. But this time-period can properly be symbolized only by a time-period. In Pharaoh's dream years were indeed symbolized by ears of corn and by kine; but such symbols cannot well express time as the attribute of an animal-symbol already produced. The only method left is to represent the duration of the nation's life by a time-symbol suitable to an animal's life, as a year by a day. This understood, Professor Cowles's entire argument evaporates.

"The word *time*," he tells us, even in symbolical prophecy, "means *time*, and *hour* means *hour*;" and so *day* must mean *day* and not *year*. Very true. As the word *lion* means *lion*, so *day* means *day;* but then, also, as the real *lion* symbolizes a *kingdom*, so the real *day* may also symbolize a *year*. Professor Cowles, like Prof. Stuart, commits the very confusion of idea that he attributes to his opponents. He confounds the signification of the word with the symbolic application of the thing. Both the words *lion* and *day* *signify* the literal things of which they are the names; and then both the things are applied to *symbolize* some specified object. It follows that both professors are very incorrect in saying that the year-day theory is unsustained by any example in Scripture. The case of Ezekiel (iv, 4–6) is an absolute parallel. He was commanded to lie on his right side forty days, to symbolize Israel under forty years of sin; and upon his left side three hundred and ninety days, to symbolize Judah's three hundred and ninety years of sin—"I have appointed thee a day for a year." Here Ezekiel represented, say, Judah; his lying on his left side represented Judah's sin, and each day of his lying symbolized a year. The proportion was: as Ezekiel to Judah, so a day to a year. Very nugatory is Professor Cowles's argument to invalidate this case: "But observe throughout this passage that in every instance the word day is used for a common day." Of course the word day must be used for a common day in order to bring the common day in as a symbol; but then the common day may be as truly used for a symbol of a year as a beast is for a kingdom.

On the same mental confusion is founded the argument drawn from numerous non-symbolical prophetic passages in which the word day and the word year are used literally. So far as this argument is used we could admit that the word *day*, like the word *beast*, is always used literally; but that would not be denying that both *things* are used symbolically; the *beast* to symbolize a *kingdom* and the *day* to symbolize a *year*.

The same fallacy reigns in the Professors' argument on Num. xiv, 33, 34. God there threatened the Israelites that as their spies searched the land for forty days, so they should wander in the desert forty years, "a day for a year." The Professors clearly show that the word day here *signifies* a literal day; but they do not disprove what Jehovah positively declares, namely, that a literal day *represents* a year. So that our conclusion on the whole is, that there still remains an unrefuted plausibility in the idea that the 1260 days of the Apocalyptic beast do represent as many years. The idea is somewhat sustained by unquestionable examples and by the very nature of the case.

The Life of Jesus the Christ. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. Vol. I. With 48 fine wood engravings. 8vo., pp. 387. Cloth, gilt. New York: J. B. Ford & Co.

As to a work demanding the highest human talent, Mr. Beecher has justly consecrated the best maturity of his powers to the production of a Life of the Christ. It is an offering of faith and love to the sole divine-human One. He has thought it worthy of the best adornment that art could contribute. It is the monument by which he hopes to speak most permanently and most articulately to posterity. We doubt not that in this respect his expectation will be fulfilled. The great preacher of our age will be best known to the future as the great biographer.

The work is not characterized by surpassingly profound research. He has not gone beyond the circle of a few well-known commentators. Nor do we look to him for the solution of profound theological problems. He has not thought much in the rout of doctrinal systems. It is in his deep and flashing intuitions, his comprehensive grasp, his eloquent dissertations that we recognize the master, and rejoice that he has, as one essayist more, taken the great, inexhaustible, yet simple life to expound to the world in a voice the world will willingly hear. And when, after a few pages of Beecher, frank, loving, and earnestly Christian, we take down from our library shelves the truly Frenchy Jesus of Renan, we feel ashamed of the age that is not disgusted with the factitious.

Mr. Beecher evinces the earnestness of his faith by adopting that view of the nature of Christ which most tasks our belief, even to the sacrifice of our indestructible intuitions—the theory, namely, that the Infinite minified itself to the finite, and became the human soul of Jesus. He also denies the theory of verbal inspiration, or the necessity of inspired accuracy in details outside the limits of religious truths. The effort to sustain the absolute accuracy of the sacred writer in non-essential points he holds to be conducive to a strain of sophistry tending to produce infidelity far more strongly than the admission of incidental error. Mr. Beecher affirms that miracles are no suspension of the laws of nature, but a disclosure to the view of a higher law of a higher nature, a revelation of the universe-nature above the earth-nature. This we hold to be the true view, and rejoice to find it expressed with so much truth and beauty in these pages.

◆

The State of the Dead. By Rev. ANSON WEST. 12mo., pp. 258. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1871.

This is an able and subtle essay, written by the Pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Huntsville, Ala., maintain-

The Life of Jesus the Christ. By Henry Ward Beecher. Vol. I. With steel and wood engravings. 8vo., pp. 387. Cloth, gilt. New York: J. B. Ford & Co.

As to a work demanding the highest human talent, Mr. Beecher has justly consecrated the best maturity of his powers to the production of a Life of the Christ. It is an offering of faith and love to the sole divine-human One. He has thought it worthy of the best adornment that art could contribute. It is the monument by which he hopes to speak most permanently and most articulately to posterity. We doubt not that in this respect his expectation will be fulfilled. The great preacher of our age will be best known to the future as the great biographer.

The work is not characterized by surpassingly profound research. He has not gone beyond the circle of a few well-known commentators. Nor do we look to him for the solution of profound theological problems. He has not thought much in the vein of doctrinal systems. It is in his deep and flashing intuitions, his comprehensive grasp, his eloquent dissertations that we recognize the master, and rejoice that he has, as the essential move, taken the great, inexhaustible, yet simple life to expound to the world in a voice the world will willingly hear. And when, after a few pages of Beecher, frank, loving, and earnestly Christian, we take down from our library shelves the truly Frenchy *Jesus* of Renan, we feel ashamed of the age that is not disgusted with the mendicant.

Mr. Beecher evinces the earnestness of his faith by adopting that view of the nature of Christ which most taxes our belief, even to the sacrifice of our indestructible intuitions—the theory, namely, that the Infinite minified itself to the finite, and became the human soul of Jesus. He also denies the theory of verbal suggestion, or the necessity of inspired accuracy in details outside the limits of religious truths. The effort to sustain the absolute accuracy of the sacred writer in non-essential points he holds to be conducive to a strain of sophistry tending to produce infidelity far more strongly than the admission of incidental error. Mr. Beecher affirms that miracles are no suspension of the laws of nature, but a disclosure to the view of a higher law of a higher nature, a revelation of the mysterious nature above the earth-nature. This we hold to be the true view, and rejoice to find it expressed with so much truth and beauty in these pages.

◆

The State of the Dead. By Rev. Anson West. 12mo., pp. 282. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1871.

This is an able and minute essay, written by the Pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Huntsville, Ala., [illegible] ing, in opposition to the teachings of Pearson, Wesley, and Bishop M'Tyeire, that there is no "Intermediate State" of the dead, but that all souls at death depart immediately to heaven or to hell. The judgment day, however, he holds to be a great future reality at the close of this world's history, at which takes place a resurrection of the bodies of the entire human race, and their presentation before God for a divine personal review and final sentence for eternity. He quotes the Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church as a full and complete confirmation of his doctrine. It is an acute and plausible discussion, though we dissent from its conclusions.

◆

Misread Passages of Scripture. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

Baldwin Brown is an eminent minister of the English Independents, and his works are published from our Book Room rather from their general excellence and their great liberalization of old Calvinism, than as authoritative expositions of a true Wesleyan Arminianism. His keen criticisms are suggestive and inspiriting. His views of the relations of divine sovereignty to human responsibility retain some tinge of his hereditary training, yet show a clear intuition of the true solution in the midst of some vagueness. His *improvement* of the doctrine of substitutional atonement is too indefinite to be either satisfactory or dangerous to the reader. As a whole our ministry and people will find his pages instructive and quickening.

◆

Jesus Christ. His Life and Work. By E. De Pressensé, D.D. 12mo., pp. 320. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

This is a popular abridgment from the polished pen of Pressensé himself of his great work, the "Life of Christ." By an arrangement with the enterprising English house of Hodder & Stoughton, Carlton & Lanahan are the sole American publishers. It is divested of those eloquent dissertations by which Christian scholars have been so richly gratified, and with a rapid pen, in fluent and popular style, follows the divine story to its divine result. It is the character of the Saviour once more pictured for the eyes of the people.

◆

Saving Faith; Its Rationale. By Rev. Israel Chamberlayne, D.D. 12mo., pp. 216. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

Dr. Chamberlayne defends our Church from what is called by our Congregational brethren Stoddardism—the practice of forming a Church of unconverted membership. The work is done with a ing, in opposition to the teachings of Pearson, Wesley, and Bishop M'Ilvaine, that there is no "intermediate state" of the dead, but that all souls at death depart immediately to heaven or to hell. The judgment day, however, he holds to be a grand future reality at the close of this world's history, at which takes place a resurrection of the bodies of the entire human race, and their presentation before God for a divine personal review and final sentence for eternity. He quotes the Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church as a full and complete confirmation of his doctrine. It is an acute and plausible discussion, though we dissent from its conclusions.

Misread Passages of Scripture. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. 12mo., pp. 198. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

Baldwin Brown is an eminent minister of the English Independents, and his works are published from our Book Room rather for their general excellence and their great liberalization of old Calvinism, than as authoritative expositions of a true Wesleyan Arminianism. His keen criticisms are suggestive and inspiriting. His views of the relations of divine sovereignty to human responsibility retain some tinge of his hereditary training, yet show a clear intuition of the true solution in the midst of some vagueness. His disparagement of the doctrine of substitutional atonement is too indefinite to be either satisfactory or dangerous to the reader. As a whole our ministry and people will find his pages instructive and quickening.

Jesus Christ. His Life and Work. By E. De Pressensé, D.D. 12mo., pp. 284. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

This is a popular abridgment from the polished pen of Pressensé himself of his great work, the "Life of Christ." By an arrangement with the enterprising English house of Hodder & Stoughton, Carlton & Lanahan are the sole American publishers. It is divested of those eloquent dissertations by which Christian scholars have been so richly gratified, and with a rapid pen, in fluent and popular style, follows the divine story to its divine result. It is the character of the Saviour once more pictured for the eyes of the people.

Saving Faith, its Rationale. By Rev. Israel Chamberlayne, D.D. 12mo., pp. 216. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

Dr. Chamberlayne defends our Church from what is called by our Congregational brethren Stoddardism—the practice of forming a Church of unconverted membership. The work is done with a vigorous and solid logic, backed with a mass of grand old English theology. The work will permanently stand, both as a warning against the practice, and a defense of our Church from the charge, of intending to indulge it.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Fragments of Science for Unscientific People. A Series of detached Essays, Lectures, and Reviews. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D., F.R.S. 12mo. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

This volume of fugitive pieces is not only science for the scientific, but pantheistic doubt for the unsuspecting. Under the guise of science we have a philosophy borrowed from, or at least in unison with, the doctrines of Carlyle, Emerson, and Goethe. With this philosophy, lying in the misty interval between pantheism and atheism, the Professor so skillfully fringes his science, that it seems to gain from his dictum all the authority of demonstrated science itself, and in that attractive guise is scattered broadcast among the unscientific. Yet his frank audacity expresses itself in no imperious forms. Mr. Tyndall's style is not like Huxley's, denunciatory and pugnacious, full of will and battle, but soft and flowing as Apollo's lute, and variegated with all the spontaneous hues of a versatile fancy. Yet under all this winning gentleness the inexorable purpose exists. He inculcates the necessity of disciplining the mind to gradually accepting, with as little dread as possible, those inevitable truths which, suddenly announced, would produce a fearful shock, and which themselves are, in fact, but preparatory to still more fearful mysteries of truth. The panic must be soothed with the thought that every advance hitherto of the human mind from fetichism into science has been dreaded as a march into irreligion. Who knows but, after all, atheism, annihilationism, and the identification of humanity with brutalism may not be the right road to a nobler philosophy and a purer and more fervent piety?

Make to Professor Tyndall the concession that Lucretius demanded, "that the atoms move in tune" to the music of law, especially of a sufficiently flexible law, and God is superfluous. He will fix you up a first-class universe without any theistic aid. In his "Religion of Chemistry" Professor Cooke showed how elementary substances, with their repulsions and attractions, were all wonderful evidences of a great constructive mind. But Professor Tyndall sees nothing but the wonderful harmonic yet unintelligent marches of the atoms. The atoms, spontaneously, each take their vigorous and solid logic, backed with a mass of proof and English theology. The work will permanently stand, both as a warning against the practice, and a defense of our Church from the charge of intending to indulge it.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Fragments of Science for Unscientific People. A Series of detached Essays, Lectures, and Reviews. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D., F.R.S. 12mo. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

This volume of fugitive pieces is not only science for the scientific, but pantheistic doubts for the unscientific. Under the guise of science we have a philosophy borrowed from, or at least in unison with, the doctrines of Carlyle, Emerson, and Goethe. With this philosophy, lying in the misty interval between pantheism and atheism, the Professor so skillfully fringes his science that it seems to gain from his dictum all the authority of demonstrated science itself, and in that attractive guise is circulated broadcast among the unscientific. Yet his least unkindly expressed doubt is in its pernicious forms. Mr. Tyndall's style is not like Huxley's, dogmatic and pugnacious, full of will and battle, but soft and flowing as Apollo's lute, and variegated with all the spontaneous hues of a versatile fancy. Yet under all this winning gentleness the immovable purpose exists. He inculcates the necessity of disciplining the mind to gradually accepting, with as little dread as possible, those inevitable truths which, suddenly announced, would produce a fearful shock, and which themselves are, in fact, but preparatory to still more fearful mysteries of truth. The pious mind is soothed with the thought that every advance hitherto of the human mind from fetichism into science has been dreaded as a march into irreligion. Who knows but, after all, atheism, annihilationism, and the identification of humanity with brutality may not be the right road to a nobler philosophy and a purer and more fervent piety?

Make to Professor Tyndall the concession that Lucretius demanded, "that the atoms move in tune" to the music of law, especially of a sufficiently flexible law, and God is superfluous. He will fix you up a first class universe without any Superintendent. In his "Religion of Chemistry" Professor Cooke showed how elementary substances, with their equivalences and atomicities, were all wonderful evidences of a great constructive mind. But Professor Tyndall sees nothing but the wonderful harmonies yet unintelligent marches of the atoms. The atoms, spontaneously, each for itself due places and form a crystal. By the same self-marshaling, the atom, each for himself, nimbly trips to his proper position, and the blade of grass, the cabbage, the oak, is formed. By the same spontaneous, self-arranging movements, the atoms conspire into a human body. And when atoms all marshal themselves aright, and a perfect body is formed, would it not, if exposed to the vital air, be a living body? Undoubtedly. Nothing but sound body and fresh breath are necessary to a live man. To all this, which is truer than revelation, we must learn to listen, and brace our nerves heroically and tonically for far more terrible things to come. But, sooth to say, it is all, at last, the same trite old Lucretian materialism and atheism over again, expressed in the terms of modern science. The science is new and vigorous, but the atheism is senile and decrepit.

The identity of the old issue may be seen in Mr. Tyndall's arraying the immutability of the laws of nature against the offering of prayer for rain. We grant all that any physicist, as a physicist, and within the limits of physicism, can claim for the immutability of the laws of nature. By the light of experience and intuition he analyzes those laws and pronounces them *intrinsically* immutable. Granted. *Intrinsically*, in and of themselves, they are immutable. That is, in and of themselves they possess no power to stop or vary their own course. They contain in themselves no provision for self-suspension or self-deflection. That is all physicism, within her own limits, and exercising all the range she possesses, namely, of examining the laws themselves, can say. But mark! *the question of miracles is not a question of the nature of nature's laws.* The question still remains untouched. May not the course of events under those immutable laws be interrupted or deflected by the interposition of a Power from without or from above mere nature? This question, by its very terms, is without the limits of physicism. It takes no issue with the immutability of nature's laws. The question now is, as to the existence of that Power above nature, and as to His nature, and what He is likely to do; and then a new field is opened of inquiry by different faculties, and with a different set of facts, which inquiry, as it spontaneously grows, becomes theology. Professor Tyndall argues the whole question within the limits of physicism, just as if there were no God above physics. Next it is to be inquired, *Has such interposition ever, in fact, taken place?* and that is a question of history.

Mark, the question is not now whether the laws of nature have ever been suspended, but *whether an event, or course of events, under those laws has ever been modified by the interposition of a* due places and form a crystal. By the same self-arranging, the atom, each for himself, wisely trips to his proper position, and the blade of grass, the cabbage, the oak, is formed. By the same spontaneous, self-arranging movements, the atoms compile into a human body. And when atoms all marshal themselves aright, and a perfect body is formed, would it not, if exposed to the vital air, be a living body? Undoubtedly. Nothing but sound body and fresh breath are necessary to a live man. To all this, which is truer than revelation, we must learn to listen, and brace our nerves intellectually and tonically for far more terrible things to come. But, sooth to say, it is all, at last, the same trite old Lucretian materialism and atheism over again, expressed in the terms of modern science. The science is new and vigorous, but the atheism is senile and decrepit.

The identity of the old issue may be seen in Mr. Tyndall's arraying the immutability of the laws of nature against the offering of prayer for rain. We grant all that any physicist, as a physicist, and within the limits of physicism, can claim for the immutability of the laws of nature. By the light of experience and intuition he analyzes those laws and pronounces them intrinsically immutable. Granted. *Intrinsically*, in and of themselves, they are immutable. That is, in and of themselves they possess no power to stop or vary their own course. They contain in themselves no provision for self-suspension or self-deflection. That is all physicism, within her own limits, and exercising all the range she possesses, namely, of examining the laws themselves, can say. But mark! *the question of miracles is not a question of the nature of nature's laws.* The question still remains untouched. May not the course of events under those immutable laws be interrupted or deflected by the interposition of a Power from without or from above mere nature? This question, by its very terms, is without the limits of physicism. It takes no issue with the immutability of nature's laws. The question now is, as to the existence of that Power above nature, and as to His nature, and what He is likely to do; and then a new field is opened of inquiry by different faculties, and with a different set of facts, which inquiry, as it systematically grows, becomes theology. Professor Tyndall argues the whole question within the limits of physicism, just as if there were no God above physics. Next it is to be inquired, *Has such interposition ever, in fact, taken place?* and that is a question of history.

Mark, the question is not now whether the laws of nature have ever been suspended, but *whether an event, or course of events, under those laws has ever been modified by the interposition of a* *superhuman volition?* A suspension of a law is one thing, a modification of an event or course of events, under law, is another. There are laws which cannnot be suspended, as the law of causation, or the laws of mathematical relations. When a ball is thrown from a player's hand, the laws of nature would carry it to the utmost exhaustion of its force. Should another player's bat stop it midway, would that law be suspended? Not at all. The course of the ball and its stoppage by the bat are both under nature's laws. If an Homeric hero hurls his javelin powerfully enough to reach his foe, but the Goddess Pallas turns it from its course, no law is suspended; only a new antecedent comes in, and, under law, modifies the course of events. So if, by the unchanged course of nature's law Peter will be drowned, and Jesus interposes, the miracle is no suspension of nature's law. And even if God at the word of Joshua arrested the sun in his course, there was no more a suspension of law than when the player arrested the ball with his bat. Simply a new force comes in, and under the law of forces the course of events is changed.

Dr. Tyndall expends several useless pages in showing that the law of atmospheric pressure, for instance, first explained by Torricelli and confirmed by Pascal, has never varied. The laws of gravitation are by experience proved invariable. Undoubtedly; and miracles not only admit such invariability but assume it. *Were there no invariable law there could be no miracle.* There could neither be any course of events to interrupt, nor any law of forces to interpose the interruption. For the very interruption and interposition must take place and proceed from the interposer through the course and force of law. The whole question then, the conclusion again returns, is removed from the court of physicism, and becomes a question as to the existence of a competent and probable interposer, namely, a God, and as to the ascertained historical *fact* of the interposition.

In regard to materialism the mind of Mr. Tyndall is in equilibrium. The following passages are clear in statement but twilight in conclusion.

> "I hardly imagine there exists a profound scientific thinker, who has reflected upon the subject, unwilling to admit the extreme probability of the hypothesis that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought, or of emotion, a definite molecular condition of motion or structure is set up in the brain; or who would be disposed even to deny that if the motion or structure be induced by internal causes instead of external, the effect on consciousness will be the same."
>
> "I think the materialist will be able, finally, to maintain this position against all attacks, but I do not think, in the present condition of the human mind, that he can pass beyond this position. I do not think he is entitled to say that his molecular groupings and his molecular motions *explain* every thing. In reality they explain

superhuman volition? A suspension of a law is one thing; a modification of an event or course of events, under law, is another. There are laws which cannot be suspended, as the law of succession, or the laws of mathematical relations. When a ball is thrown from a player's hand, the laws of nature would carry it to the utmost exhaustion of its force. Should another player's bat stop it midway, would that law be suspended? Not at all. The course of the ball and its stoppage by the bat are both under nature's laws. If an Homeric hero hurls his javelin powerfully enough to reach his foe, but the Goddess Pallas turns it from its course, no law is suspended; only a new antecedent comes in, and, under law, modifies the course of events. So if, by the unchanged course of nature's law Peter will be drowned, and Jesus intervenes, the miracle is no suspension of nature's law. And even if God at the word of Joshua arrested the sun in his course, there was no more a suspension of law than when the player arrested the ball with his bat. Simply a new force comes in, and under the law of forces the course of events is changed.

Dr. Tyndall expends several useless pages in showing that the law of atmospheric pressure, for instance, first explained by Torricelli and confirmed by Pascal, has never varied. The laws of gravitation are by experience proved invariable. Undoubtedly; and miracles not only admit such invariability but assume it. Were there no invariable law there could be no miracle. There could neither be any course of events to interrupt, nor any law of forces to interpose the interruption. For the very interruption and interposition must take place and proceed from the interposer through the course and force of law. The whole question then, the conclusion again returns, is removed from the realm of physicism, and becomes a question as to the existence of a competent and probable interposer, namely, a God, and as to the ascertained historical *fact* of the intervention.

In regard to materialism the mind of Mr. Tyndall is in equilibrium. The following passages are clear in statement but twilight in conclusion.

"I hardly imagine there exists a profound scientific thinker, who has reflected upon the subject, unwilling to admit the extreme probability of the hypothesis, that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought, or of emotion, a definite molecular condition of motion or structure is set up in the brain; or who would be disposed even to deny that if the motion or structure be induced by internal causes instead of external, the effect on consciousness will be the same.

"I think the materialist will be able finally to maintain this position against all attacks; but I do not think, in the present condition of the human mind, that he can pass beyond this position. I do not think he is entitled to say that his molecular groupings and his molecular motions explain every thing. In reality they explain

> nothing. The utmost he can affirm is the association of two classes of phenomena of whose real bond of union he is in absolute ignorance. The problem of the connection of body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the prescientific ages." "On both sides of the zone here assigned to the materialist he is equally helpless. If you ask him whence is this 'matter' of which we have been discoursing, who or what divided it into molecules, who or what impressed upon them this necessity of running into organic forms, he has no answer. Science is mute in reply to these questions. But if the materialist is confounded and science is rendered dumb, who else is prepared with a solution? To whom has this arm of the Lord been revealed? Let us lower our heads and acknowledge our ignorance, priest and philosopher, one and all."—Pp. 118–121.

The scientist may, indeed, bow in this dark doubt; not so the philosopher or the Christian. Philosophy asserts the supremacy, universal and eternal, of mind over matter. Were the universe filled with a boundless ocean of pure, even dead, physical force, it could never stir without directive mind to differentiate and define its movements. Force could never move force; but mind, without being force, and without exerting force, is the evidence of something superior to force, power—power to control force. We know from our conscious experience that mind, *will*, does control matter organized into obedience to it, and nowhere do we see mind but it sits enthroned over matter. In the brain, as in the universe, mind is lord and master. And in the factors, mind and brain co-operating, as thus distinctly presented by Dr. Tyndall, we can easily see the refutation of the assumption of Professor Barker and other aspirants for materialistic glory, that because the acting brain under mental emotion gives out heat, therefore mind is but one of the circle of correlated forces. In order for the brain to act, it must have and exert physical force, and until exact measurement shows the contrary, this molecular central action accounts for all the heat. Even in common parlance there must be brain strength for brain action. The brain can no more work under mental direction without force, than the legs; and there is no more wonder that heat comes from the brain in thinking than from the legs in walking.

◆

The Mystery of Life. An Essay in reply to Dr. Gull's Attack on the Theory of Vitality in his Harveian Oration for 1870. By Lionel S. Beale, M.B., F.R.S. 12mo., pp. 71. London: J. & A. Churchill. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1871.

We introduced Dr. Beale to our readers in a former Quarterly as the great leader in Microscopy at the present day, and as, therefore, the most authoritative expounder living of the Doctrine of Life from the physical side. His conclusions, fearlessly announced as the result of experimental knowledge, are very unwelcome to the self-sufficient blusterers of the materialistic-atheistic,

protoplastic school of Huxley and Tyndall. How impudently and how vainly these blatant gentlemen endeavor to browbeat him, their unquestionable master in the science from which he speaks, may appear from the following extracts:

> It is indeed significant if, as seems to be the case at this time in England, an investigator cannot be permitted to remark that facts which he has demonstrated, and phenomena which he has observed, render it impossible for him to assent at present to the dogma that *life is a mode of ordinary force*, without being held up, by some who entertain opinions at variance with his own, as a person who desires to stop or retard investigation, who disbelieves in the correlation of the physical forces, and in the established truths of physics.*
>
> Is it possible that belief in a something, a power, force, agency, or call it what you will, which is beyond the range of physical and chemical investigation, and cannot be rendered evident to the senses, should disqualify a man for scientific investigation any more than a belief in a God renders it impossible for him to successfully pursue observation and experiment? It ought not to be necessary to state that the proposition that *vital power* is distinct from *force* does not involve a belief in the absurdity that life creates matter or transmutes one element into another.
>
> Whatever may be the fate of the inferences I have drawn concerning the nature of *vital actions*, they have been deduced from facts of observation. The theory has, as it were, forced itself upon me in the course of my work. In the spring of 1861 I had the honor of delivering, at the College of Physicians, a course of lectures "On the Structure and Growth of the Simple Tissues of the Body;" during the delivery of which upward of sixty microscopical specimens were exhibited and described. The conclusions I drew were based upon the facts thus publicly demonstrated.—Pp. 5–7.

Dr. Gull, in reply to whom this monograph was written, maintains that life, or the thought-power, is but one of the forms of force, convertible with heat, electricity, motion, etc. Dr. Beale's replies are mainly two. First, experiment has never been able to transform force into life; and second, the properties of force and life are so different that the entities cannot be identified.

The following is his decision as to the experimental proof:

> Notwithstanding all that has been asserted to the contrary, *not one vital action has yet been accounted for by physics and chemistry.* The assertion that life is correlated force rests upon assertion alone, and we are just as far from an explanation of vital phenomena by force hypotheses as we were before the discovery of the doctrine of the correlation of the physical forces. In short, this most important discovery in physics does not affect the question of the nature of the phenomena peculiar to living beings.
>
> Each additional year's labor only serves to confirm me more strongly than before in the opinion that the physical doctrine of life cannot be sustained, and when

---

* "Dr. Tyndall goes even still further. Instead of answering arguments, he gives expression to some of the words of his friend Huxley, and speaks of me as a 'microscopist, ignorant alike of philosophy and biology,' and as having been 'lately Professor in a London College, famous for its orthodoxy.' That I am not a convert to the philosophy and biology of Tyndall and Huxley is perfectly true; but that my connection with King's College has in any way influenced my views is a suggestion as devoid of foundation as the fiery-cloud hypothesis of evolution itself."

protoplastic school of Huxley and Tyndall. How flippantly and how rashly these distant gentlemen endeavor to browbeat Dr. Beale, their unquestionable master in the science from which he speaks, may appear from the following extracts:*

It is indeed significant if, as seems to be the case at this time, a conscientious investigator cannot be permitted to remark that [illegible] and phenomena which he has observed cannot at present be explained, [illegible] at present to the degree that life is a mode of ordinary force, without being laughed at by some who sincerely [illegible] with his own, as a person who wishes to stop or retard investigation, who disbelieves in the correlation of the physical forces, and in the established truths of physics.

Is it possible that belief in a something, a power, force, energy, or call it what you will, which is beyond the range of physical and chemical investigation and cannot be rendered evident to the senses, should disqualify a man for scientific investigation any more than a belief in a God renders it impossible for him to successfully pursue observation and experiment? It ought not to be necessary to state that the proposition that vital power is distinct from force does not involve a belief in the absurdity that life created matter or necessarily can be converted into another.

Whatever may be the fate of the inferences I have drawn concerning the nature of vital actions, they have been deduced from facts of observation. This theory has, as it were, forced itself upon me in the course of my work. In the spring of 1861 I had the honor of delivering, at the College of Physicians, a course of lectures "On the Structure and Growth of the Simple Tissues of the Body," during the delivery of which upward of sixty microscopical specimens were exhibited and described. The conclusions I drew were based upon the facts then publicly demonstrated.—Pp. 3-5.

Dr. Gull, in reply to whom this monograph was written, maintains that life, or the thought-power, is but one of the forms of force, convertible with heat, electricity, motion, etc. Dr. Beale's replies are mainly two: First, experiment has never been able to transform force into life; and second, the properties of force and life are so different that the two cannot be identified.

The following is his decision as to the experimental proof:

Notwithstanding all that has been asserted to the contrary, not one vital action has yet been accounted for by physics and chemistry. The assertion that vital is correlated force rests upon assertion alone, and we are just as far from an explanation of vital phenomena by mere hypotheses as we were before the discovery of the doctrine of the correlation of the physical forces. In short, this most important discovery in physics does not affect the question of the nature of the phenomena peculiar to living beings.

Each additional fact [illegible] more strongly than before in the opinion that the [illegible] of life cannot be explained, and that

---

* "Dr. Tyndall goes somewhat further. Instead of answering my remarks, he gives expression to some of the words of his friend Huxley, who speaks of me as a 'microscopist, ignorant alike of philosophy and biology,' and as 'some time lately Professor in a London College, famous for its orthodoxy.' This is [illegible] a reproach to the philosophy and biology of Tyndall and Huxley, [illegible] but that my connection with King's College has [illegible] is a suggestion as absurd [illegible] as the [illegible] Beale."

I review in my mind the evidence upon which the doctrine of *vitality* rests, it appears to me extraordinary that any one can persuade himself that a thing, possessing in itself the power or property of transforming matter and force in a definite way, is itself mere matter and force—that that which *converts* is no more than that which *is converted.*—P. 9.

On the difference between *Vital Power* and Force:

> The relation between *vital power* and the ordinary forces of matter may not be more intimate than the relation between the man who makes a water-mill and the forces which raise the water that drives the wheel, or the materials of which the mill is constructed. And yet the water-mill could not have been made by the water, nor by the wood nor iron which in part constitute the mill nor by the mighty forces imprisoned in these materials. The man, not the forces of the matter or of the water, *constructs* the mill. Where, then, is the evidence that justifies Dr. Gull, and those whom he follows, in asserting that any *form or mode of ordinary force has constructive power?* Force is mighty, force is powerful, and force may be *destructive;* but what evidence can be adduced in favor of the *constructive* agency of any mode of force? Can any or all the forms of force yet discovered *construct* an insignificant monad any more than they can make an umbrella or build a house? Dr. Gull neither notices the objections which have been raised to the view concerning the *forming, building,* and *constructing* powers of force, nor adduces one new fact or argument in its support.—Pp. 10, 11.

Herbert Spencer builds his great structure of biology (or life-science) in order to show that the entire system of living beings has arisen by purely unguided, unintelligent natural forces; so that neither God nor planning mind was needed to evolve the wonderful result. His greatest difficulty, of course, is at the point where forms of life are molded into intellective shapes. But the *crystal* is his grand transition stepping-stone. The crystal does form into symmetrical shapes, it grows; just as animal bodies form into symmetrical shapes, and grow. The difference is in the different degrees of complexity. All this, however, fails to meet the case. The crystal forms to stiff mathematical shapes, such as unintelligent forces by mutual interaction may produce. They may be, like chemical compounds, the rigid results of rectilinear affinities and repulsions, requiring no contingent guidance. But life-forms are *intellectively varied.* They are varied in plans, and selected modes and models. What selective power distributes the particles of matter so as to form the beauty of a maiden's cheek, and the varied styles of beauty of a thousand different faces? These are molded, fashioned, esthetically and artistically planned, and no science has as yet made the first successful step toward showing how they can be otherwise than mind-molded. Force, motion, electricity, can do nothing here.

One grand distinction of living beings is *heredity.* Every *species* is a secret society; and the secret by it possessed is its *vital formative power*, by which a given form of living being produces another form of living being of its own order. Crystals do not

beget crystals; minerals are not *born* from minerals. And living beings are as unique in death as in birth.

> The crystaline matter can be redissolved, and will crystalize again as many times as we like, but the monad matter cannot be redissolved and reformified, any more than a dog or a man can be dissolved and then produced again from the solution. Neither man, nor any living thing, nor any kind of living matter, can be dissolved, for that which *lives* is incapable of solution. It may be *killed,* and then some of the products resulting from its death may be dissolved, but this is a very different thing *from dissolving the living matter.* Nor can the lifeless substances which are dissolved ever be made to assume again the form and character they once possessed. Nor under any circumstances can the living thing, once dead, be made to live again, even if no attempts whatever be made to effect its solution.—Pp. 30, 31.

The Debateable Land Between this World and the Next. With Illustrative Narratives. By Robert Dale Owen, author of "Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World." 12mo. New York: G. W. Carleton & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

The "Footfalls" of Mr. Owen, lately by us noticed, confined itself to those apparently superhuman phenomena which take place without any known human agency. The present volume embraces phenomena apparently resulting from voluntary human processes, and hence includes the facts of modern so-called Spiritualism, such as table-turning, medium-writing, evocation of the dead, etc. The work evinces all the care and skill in regard to clearness of evidence that we ascribed to the former volume. Assuming Mr. Owen's own sound-mindedness, intellectual and moral, the observed facts do not seem to be at all explained by the scientific solutions furnished by the article in the London Quarterly noticed in our Synopsis.

Mr. Owen's volume is truly made up of two books that have very little to do with each other. His narratives form a body for special study as to their validity, and, admitting their validity, of great interest. But besides this there is a large mass of theological or antitheological matter which is very irrelevant. Mr. Owen addresses the clergy, plainly intimating that he thinks that they are an isolated, unworldly class, who do not read the newspapers but who somehow or other will read his books. Had not Mr. Owen better address the *savants* instead of the clergy? When he has won over Huxley, Tyndall, and the scientific associations generally, it will be time for him to come to the clergy, and tell them that Christianity will be greatly aided by the strength of spiritualism. At the present time it is to be feared that the alliance would be a burden to religion, redoubling rather than diminishing the hostility and contempt of the scientific world. Clearly, then, Mr. Owen makes not a sustainable demand when he

asks them to vacate their system of its orthodoxy, and minify itself to Spiritualism alone, until Spiritualism can vindicate its status with some assurance.

Mr. Owen gives us a list of negations, denying the atonement, inspiration, and miracles of Christ, which, as it seems to us, are his own mere *dicta*, not resulting at all as logical sequences from his spiritualistic facts. We could believe them all, as Wesley believed the real supernaturalism of the phenomena in his father's house, without at all disturbing our orthodoxy, or suggesting any of Mr. Owen's negations. Nay, if these phenomena do, as he claims, demonstrate a supermundane intercourse, then the great prepossession against the miracles is vacated. Jesus, in fact, then appears as the greatest miraculous fact in history.

With his definition of a miracle, "a suspension of a law of nature," we readily concede the non-existence of any such event. But such is not the definition at the present time adopted, as we have set forth in our notice of Professor Tyndall, written before reading either Mr. Owen's book, or Mr. Beecher's Life of Jesus. Professor Wilkins, in his *Phœnicia and Palestine*, noticed on another page, says, "Miracles are often spoken of as violations of the order of nature; they are rather revelations of the true order of nature."

The Earth. A Descriptive History of the Phenomena of the Life of the Globe. By ELISEE RECLUS. Translated by the late B. B. WOODWARD, M. A. Edited by Henry Woodward, British Museum. Illustrated by two hundred and thirty maps inserted in the text, and twenty-three page maps, printed in colors. 12mo., pp. 567. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Our globe is here made to put on her most splendid attire. Her physical phenomena are unfolded in very rich detail in an animated and often eloquent style.

Reclus indorses neither the nebular origin of our globe nor the existence of a central fire. He fully admits the brilliancy of the nebular theory (according to which our planets were made by the off-throw of successive masses from the whirling nebulæ) as first suggested by Kant, and fully developed by La Place. To Kant, though not an atheist, it had a charm from the fact that the entire system of things might thereby have unfolded in all its fullness and through all its minute details, as Herbert Spencer has since professed to show, by the natural "evolution" of unintelligent causes, without any guiding mind. Reclus thus states the objections:

> But La Place himself, on putting forth this hypothesis, says that he does so "with diffidence," and no one has a right to be more confident than the great geometrician. In fact, his conjectures do not account for the presence of comets, which gravitate around the sun in determinate orbits, although according to his hypoth-

esis, they are "strangers in the solar system;" they also fail to explain the elliptical form of the planetary orbits and the inclination of their axes; finally, they appear to be contradicted by the retrograde motion of the satellites of Uranus. Some of the distant nebulæ, which were taken by astronomers to be masses of uncondensed cosmical matter, possess the most fantastic forms, which would be very difficult to explain by means of the new hypothesis; some of the nebulæ, too, are variable, and the telescope discloses them to us under very different aspects in succession. Finally, the discovery of the spectral analysis—an eternal glory to MM. Kuchloff and Bunsen—warrants us in believing that the chemical composition of the sun differs very decidedly from that of the planets forming its system; for the solar body, at least in its external layers, does not contain either silex, tin, lead, mercury, silver or gold. We must therefore confess that La Place's celebrated and seductive hypothesis is inadequate to account for all the phenomena which have been observed.

The doctrine that our globe was once a whirling mass of liquid fire, with a crust gradually thickening into solidity by a cooling-off process has, he thinks, great difficulties. A solid globe set in a whirl would probably flatten at the poles and expand at the equator as much as our globe does. A liquid globe would flatten to a disk. The fact that we find the earth grow warm the deeper we perforate proves little; for the depth of our perforations is comparatively but a film's thickness. Hopkins has plausibly shown that the shell of the globe must be solid for a thousand miles deep, and Professor Thomson and others have inferred from various premises that the center is solid. The phenomena attending volcanoes are best solved on the supposition of extensive subterranean seas of fire. On the whole, the science of globe-making appears to be, like our city of New York, not quite finished.

A History of Philosophy. From Thales to the Present Time. By DR. FRIEDRICH UEBERWEG: late Professor of Philosophy at Königsberg. Translated from the fourth German edition, by GEORGE S. MORRIS, A.M., Professor of Modern Languages in Michigan University. With Additions by NOAH PORTER, LL.D., D.D., President of Yale College. With Preface, by the Editors of the Philosophical and Theological Library. Vol. I, History of the Ancient and Mediæval Philosophy. 8vo., pp. 487. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

This is the first instalment of a new enterprise. Drs. Schaff and H. B. Smith, as editors, propose to publish "a select and compact Library of Text and Reference Books upon all the main departments of Theology and Philosophy, adapted to the wants especially of ministers and students in all the denominations." The plan includes both translations from foreign languages and original works by American authors. We welcome the project, though we doubt not the publications will contain some things that we cannot indorse. The prospectus announces a critical edition of Tichendorf's *Greek Testament*, Van Osterzee's *Didactic Theolgy*, and *Patristics*, by Prof. R. D. Hitchcock.

The present work by Ueberweg is intended as an intermediate in

size between the voluminous Ritter and the compendious Schwegler. The author was born in 1826, made Professor of Philosophy in Königsberg in 1862, and died June 7, 1871. He was the author of a Logic, a translation of which was published in London. The present translation is made with the author's consent, and "on the day of his death he carefully corrected some of the proof-sheets, and was delighted with their accuracy."

We augur great good from this whole series of publications. It will show that in this very hour of a vaunting materialism boasting over the death of all spiritual philosophy, not only philosophy but psychology and theology are amply able to issue a triumphant self-assertion.

The Intuitions of the Mind, Inductively Investigated. By Rev. JAMES M'COSH, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 450. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.

To this standard volume the Quarterly has given two book-notices, and one able article in full by the late Dr. Dempster. It furnishes the firm psychological ground, on which we must stand against all modern materialism. It should, therefore, come into the course of any well-read metaphysical inquirer.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The History of Methodism in Kentucky. By Rev. A. H. REDFORD, D.D. Three volumes, 12mo., pp. 479, 512, 554. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1870. On sale by Carlton & Lanahan.

Too many books of history, such as these volumes of Redford's, can hardly be written. Now is the time to write them. Precious mementoes of the early times of Methodism lie around us on every side, like the manna which fell in the wilderness and lay round about the host in the morning; but, like the manna, these memorials must be gathered while the dew is upon them, for when the sun waxes hot they will be gone.

The field which our author traverses is rich in materials. Kentucky was long the scene of Indian wars, "the dark and bloody ground" of murderous conflict with a wily foe. Her first settlers were men of strong arms and fearless hearts, and their history is a wild romance, an epic of the woods, full of the records of lofty courage and fearful suffering. And the history of the founders of Methodism in Kentucky is also a grand romance of toil and danger, and at the same time a holy record of faith and hope and courage, whose mighty deeds win the crown. The pioneers of the Gospel kept pace with the pioneers of secular life. They took their long

and solitary rides through the forest, searching out the scattered settlements, and preaching the word of life to those who, but for their unselfish labors, were as sheep having no shepherd. Bishop Asbury, in his episcopal visitations to these perilous regions, was often accompanied from place to place by a guard of armed men, and his Journal records his thanksgivings for safe passage through the dark domain of the panther and the savage.

Dr. Redford has done his work well. The narrative is smooth and flowing, the description vivid, the general style accurate and eloquent. He delights in his work, and writes *con amore*, as every man should who writes at all. He has done well a thing well worth doing in gathering the relics of an age fast receding into the dim past. The interest is not as local as might be supposed. Not a few names which are household words east of the Alleghanies appear in these Western annals, and even shine there with new luster. Some who labored hard and successfully both east and west of the mountains, here for the first time receive fitting notice, possibly in some cases because they did their best work in the West, amid the excitements of a new field, and new provocations to effort.

One striking feature of the times was the propensity for public debate in regard to doctrines and Church usages. Calvinist and Campbellite, Baptist and Methodist, seemed to ride about, lance in rest, like the knights of old, ready to challenge to mortal combat any man who doubted that their ecclesiastical lady-love was the fairest of all the daughters of truth. A goodly specimen of these theological battles is found on page 232 of the first volume. In 1792 Valentine Cook traveled the Pittsburgh Circuit. Mr. Cook was warned by letter that he was not needed within the bounds of a certain "parish." He replied, and the correspondence went on till at last a challenge to public debate was given and accepted. The time and place were named, and a great crowd, with scarcely a friend of Methodism in the whole concourse, assembled to witness the contest. The champion of Calvinism, the Rev. Mr. Jamieson, a tough Scotch Seceder, rode up, a little late, but declaring loudly, "I am here in ample time to gie the youngster a dose from which he'll not soon recover." When Mr. Cook was introduced to him he scanned him with contemptuous eyes. "What," said he, "is this the young man who has had the impertinence to assail the doctrines of grace!" An effort was made to adjust the preliminaries; but the old Scotchman would agree to no rules whatever. He meant to conduct the whole affair in his own way. When he was done, "the young man," if he had any thing to say, and the

great man. In the midst of their conversation another elderly gentleman—all of Scotch descent, and evidently of the same persuasion—spoke up, and said, with a good deal of apparent excitement and solicitude, "Sirs, I perceive that ye are in great danger of being led captive by the de'il at his will. Ha'e ye never read how that Satan can transform himsel' into an angel of light, that he may deceive the very elect, if it were possible?"

Prominent in Dr. Redford's narratives appear the names of Asbury, Whatcoat, Poythress, M'Kendree, Snethen, Cartwright, Axley, Boehm, Kavanaugh, Winans, Bascom, and a multitude of others, some strange, some familiar to our eyes. The author has excelled some of our historians in one department. He has been duly mindful of the valued and useful laymen whose holy lives and pious zeal did good service to the Church. Moreover, he has given fitting space to the devoted women "whose names are in the book of life," and who did much to further the glorious Gospel of the Son of God. This is as it should be. It is not only an act of simple justice to our people, but it will claim for the work a larger circle of readers.

There are about two pages of the fifteen hundred which the author would have done well to omit, and which we hope he will leave out of future editions. When he declares, on page 260 of the first volume, that slavery is "a purely civil institution," and therefore the Methodist Episcopal Church was wrong from the beginning in condemning it, he has the judgment of the civilized world against him. We trust his book will survive the need or the disposition to apologize for the great sin of American slavery. On page 60 of the third volume the arrest and imprisonment of a preacher of the Church South, which occurred during the war, are made the occasion of remarks which, even if there should be a shade of truth in them, can do no good now. There are plenty of facts furnishing ample grounds for retort equally bitter. Let the evil passions of those sad days of fratricidal strife be buried in the graves of our dead heroes, North and South, and all the living learn wisdom from the dread lessons of the past. As a whole, Dr. Redford's work may well stand on the same shelf with Dr. Stevens's histories in our libraries.

People of Africa. A Series of Papers on their Character, Condition, and Future Prospects. By E. W. BLYDEN, A.M., TAYLER LEWIS, D.D., and THEO. DWIGHT, Esq. 12mo., pp. 157. New York: Anson Randolph & Co. 1871.

The basis of this fine book is three articles, republished, with the Editor's consent, from our Quarterly; two by Professor Blyden, and one by Theo. Dwight, Esq. A special interest rests upon the Articles of Professor Blyden, which take their place among significant historical "first things" as the first Quarterly article

great man. In the midst of their conversation another elderly gentleman—all of Scotch descent, and evidently of the same persuasion—spoke up, and said, with a good deal of apparent excitement and solicitude, "Sirs, I perceive that ye are in great danger of being led captive by the de'il at his will. Ha'e ye never read how that Satan can transform himsel' into an angel of light, that he may deceive the very elect, if it were possible?"

Prominent in Dr. Redford's narratives appear the names of Asbury, Whatcoat, Poythress, M'Kendree, Snethen, Cartwright, Axley, Boehm, Kavanaugh, Winans, Bascom, and a multitude of others, some strange, some familiar to our eyes. The author has excelled some of our historians in one department. He has been duly mindful of the valued and useful laymen whose holy lives and pious zeal did good service to the Church. Moreover, he has given fitting space to the devoted women "whose names are in the book of life," and who did much to further the glorious Gospel of the Son of God. This is as it should be. It is not only an act of simple justice to our people, but it will claim for the work a larger circle of readers.

There are about two pages of the fifteen hundred which the author would have done well to omit, and which we hope he will leave out of future editions. When he declares, on page 260 of the first volume, that slavery is "a purely civil institution," and therefore the Methodist Episcopal Church was wrong from the beginning in condemning it, he has the judgment of the civilized world against him. We trust his book will survive the need or the disposition to apologize for the great sin of American slavery. On page 60 of the third volume the arrest and imprisonment of a preacher of the Church South, which occurred during the war, are made the occasion of remarks which, even if there should be a shade of truth in them, can do no good now. There are plenty of facts furnishing ample grounds for retort equally bitter. Let the evil passions of those sad days of fratricidal strife be buried in the graves of our dead heroes, North and South, and all the living learn wisdom from the dread lessons of the past. As a whole, Dr. Redford's work may well stand on the same shelf with Dr. Stevens's histories in our libraries.

◆

People of Africa. A Series of Papers on their Character, Condition, and Future Prospects. By E. W. BLYDEN, A.M., TAYLER LEWIS, D.D., and THEO. DWIGHT, Esq. 12mo., pp. 157. New York: Anson Randolph & Co. 1871.

The basis of this fine book is three articles, republished, with the Editor's consent, from our Quarterly; two by Professor Blyden, and one by Theo. Dwight, Esq. A special interest rests upon the Articles of Professor Blyden, which take their place among significant historical "first things" as the first Quarterly article

ever written by a negro, but which are by no means indebted to that fact alone for their value. Professor Blyden is a man of genius, and of singular acquirements amid singular disadvantages. A grace of English style rarely surpassed, a fine imagination, a linguistic erudition, and a burning Christian enthusiasm for the good of his race, mark him as a man who ought to be furnished with ample scope for his talents.

This little volume contains, among other choice pieces, a letter from Prof. Tayler Lewis to the "Independent," calling attention to these articles, but more fully to an Arabic epistle (a beautiful facsimile of which is given in the volume) written from the African King of Musāda to the President of Liberia. An article is contributed also by Professor Crummel, a son of a native African, born in Brooklyn, preparatorily educated at the Oneida Institute, N. Y., subsequently graduated at Queen's College, Cambridge, England, and for some years Professor in Liberia College. The object of issuing this very interesting volume is to awaken and cherish an intellectual and Christian interest in Africa and the Negro race.

◆

The Early Years of Christianity. The Martyrs and Apologists. By E. De Pressensé, D.D. Translated by Annie Harwood. 12mo., pp. 654. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.

The Martyrs and Apologists are the heroes of this, the second volume of Pressensé's history of our religion. It might well be called the *third* volume; for his very *first* volume presents us Jesus Christ the founder, and his second The Apostles within the New Testament era. This present volume steps out of the New Testament into the post-biblical era. Not only has Christ ascended, but the apostles have departed, and the unapostolical and uninspired history of the Church has commenced. Yet does our eloquent author find rich inspiration in his theme. The portraitures of the post-apostolic Fathers are depicted with a powerful outline, and in rich and deep, yet truthful coloring. Nowhere in our language is young Christianity so presented before our eyes as to attract our love, and inspire us with a kindred spirit. Nowhere is such ample justice done to the early heroes of the faith, to Clement of Rome, to Tertullian, to Irenæus, to Origen, and to Clement of Alexandria. Church history is no longer a dead statistical study, but a rich field for popular perusal. Not the minister alone, but the intelligent layman and the people, will find here not only instruction in historic truth, but entertainment for the imagination, and stimulant for the best emotions of our nature.

The Life of the Rev. John M'Vickar, S.T.D., Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, Belles Lettres, Political Economy, and the Evidences, in Columbia College. By his Son, WILLIAM A. M'VICKAR, D.D. 12mo., pp. 416. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1872.

This book is "A Son's Monument to a Loved and Honored Father." Dr. John M'Vickar was born in the City of New York, in the year 1787. He was graduated at Columbia College in his seventeenth year; spent two years in Europe; came home; married; was rector of a Church at Hyde Park, New York, for a few years; and in 1817 was elected to a Professorship in Columbia College, which position he occupied till 1864, four years before his death.

Phœnicia and Israel. A Historical Essay, by AUGUSTUS S. WILKINS, M.A. 12mo., pp. 201. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1871.

This is a beautiful historical essay, prepared as a University prize performance, from a number of the latest and best authorities. It is written less compactly than Smith's history—more in the dissertation style—and has room for richer coloring and more comprehensive views. It sheds a clear illumination upon the eastern margin of Israel's history. Upon the migration of Abraham from Chaldea, and the character of the earliest Caananites found by Abraham in the Promised Land, views not familiar to our sacred scholars are disclosed. Striking views are given of the Phœnicians or later Canaanites, their atrocious and cruel idolatries, and their deep desert of the judicial destruction decreed by Jehovah.

The Land of the Veda: being Personal Reminiscences of India; Its People, Castes, Thugs, and Fakirs; Its Religions, Mythology, Principal Monuments, Palaces, and Mausoleums; together with the Incidents of the Great Sepoy Rebellion, and its results to Christianity and Civilization. With a Map of India, and Forty-two Illustrations; also, Statistical Tables of Christian Missions, and a Glossary of Indian Terms used in the Work and in Missionary Correspondence. By Rev. WILLIAM BUTLER, D.D. 8vo., pp. 550. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872.

One of the most magnificent volumes ever issued from our press! Its external execution, its material, its illustrations, all are superb. It opens the gates of India to our Church, and points to fields whitening to the harvest. From the lateness of its appearance we can thus barely announce it; a future Quarterly will discuss it in a full article.

Periodicals.

The Pittsburgh Christian Advocate versus Our Methodist Episcopacy.

Our vivacious brother, the editor of the "Pittsburgh Advocate," is engaged in the heroic enterprise of destroying the Meth-

The Life of the Rev. John M'Vickar, S.T.D., Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, Belles Lettres, Political Economy, and the Evidences of Christianity, Columbia College. By his Son, WILLIAM A. M'VICKAR, D.D. 12mo., pp. 418. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1872.

This book is "A Son's Monument to a Loved and Honored Father." Dr. John M'Vickar was born in the City of New York, in the year 1787. He was graduated at Columbia College in his seventeenth year; spent two years in Europe; came home; married; was rector of a Church at Hyde Park, New York, for a few years; and in 1817 was elected to a Professorship in Columbia College, which position he occupied till 1864, four years before his death.

Palestine and Israel. A Historical Essay. By LAWRENCE S. THARPE, M.A. 16mo., pp. 281. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1871.

This is a beautiful historical essay, prepared as a University prize performance, from a number of the latest and best authorities. It is written less compactly than Smith's Dictionary—more in the dissertation style—and has room for richer coloring and more comprehensive views. It sheds a clear illumination upon the earliest origin of Israel's history. Upon the migration of Abraham from Chaldea, and the character of the earliest Canaanites found by Abraham in the Promised Land, views not familiar to our sacred scholars are disclosed. Striking views are given of the Phœnicians or later Canaanites, their atrocious and cruel idolatries, and their deep desert of the judicial destruction decreed by Jehovah.

The Land of the Veda: being Personal Reminiscences of India; its People, Castes, Thugs, and Fakirs; its Religions, Mythology, Principal Monuments, Palaces, and Mausoleums; together with the Incidents of the Great Sepoy Rebellion, and its results to Christianity and Civilization. With a Map of India, and Forty-two Illustrations; also, Statistical Tables of Christian Missions, and a Glossary of Indian Terms used in this Work and in Missionary Correspondence. By Rev. WILLIAM BUTLER, D.D. 8vo., pp. 550. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872.

One of the most magnificent volumes ever issued from our press! Its external execution, its material, its illustrations, all are superb. It opens the gates of India to our Church, and points to fields whitening to the harvest. From the lateness of its appearance we can thus barely announce it; a future Quarterly will discuss it in a full article.

Periodicals.

The Pittsburgh Christian Advocate Among the Bohemian Spectacles.

Our vivacious brother, the editor of the "Pittsburgh Advocate," is engaged in the heroic enterprise of destroying the odist Episcopal Church! Being personally an earnest Presbyterian, instead of joining some one of the several Methodist Presbyterian Churches existing he esteems it more eligible to abolish the Episcopacy of the Church to which he belongs. This rather revolutionary project he proposes to accomplish by an unconstitutional process; namely, a mere majority vote of the General Conference! And this process he advocates in rather a violent way; namely, by misrepresenting the doctrines of the defenders of our Church, by menacing them with repressive laws, by the use of opprobrious epithets, as "prelatical," and by a vociferous "We denounce" of their utterances. So far as his arguments are concerned, we could close without another word provided we could successfully ask every one interested in the subject, that after reading all that Dr. Nesbit has said in reply to us, again to read our article in careful comparison, and decide whether his *replies* are any *answer* whatever.

Dr. Nesbit is pleased to "denounce" us as "prelatical" for maintaining that our Episcopacy is an "order." The burlesque of Dr. Nesbit's setting up to "denounce" any thing we think right to say, as an editor, is sufficiently comic. It is Lilliput talking Brobdignag, and fails to be offensive by being fantastic and facetious. The dear brother may excel in good principles, but he fails in good manners. In so "denouncing" us he denounces the Methodist Discipline, which says in express terms, and in its very first section, that Wesley gave Coke "LETTERS OF EPISCOPAL ORDERS." Hereby he "inveighs against the doctrine and discipline of the Church," and commits an expellable offense.

Yet in this, our very sin of being "prelatical," Dr. Nesbit affirms that "the practice of the Church sustains Dr. Whedon; the theory condemns him." That is, "the practice" of the Church "sustains" us in being prelatical, and therefore is itself "prelatical;" that is, our ordinations are "prelatical," and so must be abolished; and John Wesley's form of ordination, or "*making* a bishop," was "prelatical;" and so John Wesley's first ordination of Coke and subsequent ordination of Mather were "prelatical," and John Wesley was therein a "prelatist." And as his ordinations were "prelatical," so our Episcopacy by him inaugurated is prelacy, and our Bishops, Asbury, Hedding, and Morris, are prelates! We are not quite as repugnant to Presbyterianism, perhaps, as Mr. Wesley was. We entertain profound veneration for Presbyterians *in their own place*, that is, *in a Presbyterian Church*. But a Presbyterian in an Episcopal

Church, and especially a Presbyterian in an Episcopal Church using office and position to "denounce" the defenders of the Episcopacy of that Church, is a problem.

For it is not really *Prelacy*, but, as we shall show, *Episcopacy*, against which, from his Presbyterian stand-point, Dr. Nesbit raises his outcry. 1. PRELACY claims to root its three orders in the New Testament as the divinely-appointed and exclusive form of Church government; it asserts unbroken descent of its prelates from the apostles, denies all essential oneness of the two or three orders, and all power of the eldership to unfold or constitute an episcopate from itself. 2. Wesley's EPISCOPACY, assuming that the Scripture prescribes no one form of government, claims its three orders to be *optional*. This Episcopacy exists only as it is framed by the free choice of the Church into her constitution, and it can be modified or abolished by the proper constitutional change, and some other form be justifiably instituted. It admits that the episcopate and eldership, while essentially *one order*, are derivatively *two*. It claims no necessary descent from the apostles, however historically probable it may be that episcopacy was sanctioned and some bishops ordained by the latest living apostles. 3. PRESBYTERIANISM, like prelacy, claiming an exclusive divine prescription, but for two orders instead of three, pronounces all other functional positions to be *offices*. Feeling the anomaly that an office should really possess greater jurisdiction and superior power over the orders, and the still greater anomaly of its being inaugurated with the proper ritual of an order, namely *ordination*, it seeks first to abolish its ordination, and then its jurisdiction and existence. It is in this last category that Dr. Nesbit stands. *He is a staunch Presbyterian*, and his battle is with our Episcopacy. His modes of battle are to assail and "denounce" the firm defenders of our constitutional Episcopacy as "Prelatists! prelatists!" He incurs this confusion and in his heart commits these indiscretions, we doubt not *honestly*; and we sincerely hope, as he comes to learn the true distinction, he will see it consistent with reason and conscience to change his position and his doings; that is, leave the Church as did Alexander M'Caine before him, or accept in heart the constitution of the Church, whose honors he is now enjoying and using to her injury.

The editors both of the Pittsburgh and Cincinnati "Advocates" quote largely such authorities as Watson, Bangs, Ezekiel Cooper and Dr. Stevens, to show (in opposition to the Discipline) that

Church, and especially a Presbyterian in an Episcopal Church using office and position to "denounce" the distinctives of the Episcopacy of that Church, is a problem.

For it is not really *Prelacy*, but, as we shall show, *Episcopacy* against which, from his Presbyterian stand-point, Dr. Nesbit raises his outcry. 1. Prelacy claims to root its three orders in the New Testament as the divinely-appointed and exclusive form of Church government; it asserts unbroken descent of its prelates from the apostles, denies all essential oneness of the two or three orders, and all power of the eldership to unfold or constitute an episcopate from itself. 2. Wesley's Episcopacy, assuming that the Scripture prescribes no one form of government, claims its three orders to be optional. This Episcopacy exists only as it is framed by the free choice of the Church into her constitution, and it can be modified or abolished by the proper constitutional change, and some other form be justifiably instituted. It admits that the episcopate and eldership, while essentially one order, are derivatively two. It claims no necessary descent from the apostles, however historically probable it may be that episcopacy was sanctioned and some bishops ordained by the latest living apostles. 3. Presbyterianism, like prelacy, claiming an exclusive divine prescription, but for two orders instead of three, pronounces all other functional positions to be offices. Feeling the anomaly that an office should really possess greater jurisdiction and superior power over the orders, and the still greater anomaly of its being inaugurated with the proper ritual of an order, namely ordination, it seeks first to abolish its ordination, and then its jurisdiction and existence. It is in this last category that Dr. Nesbit stands. *He is a stanch Presbyterian*, and his battle is with our Episcopacy. His modes of battle are to assail and "denounce" the first defenders of our constitutional Episcopacy as "Prelatists! prelatists!" He incurs this confusion and in his heart commits these indiscretions, we doubt not *honestly*, and we sincerely hope, as he comes to learn the true distinction, he will see it consistent with reason and conscience to change his position and his doings; that is, leave the Church as did Alexander M'Caine before him, or accept in heart the constitution of the Church, whose honors he is now enjoying and using to her injury.

The editors both of the Pittsburgh and Cincinnati "Advocates" quote largely such authorities as Watson, Bangs, Ezekiel Cooper, and Dr. Stevens, to show (in opposition to the Discipline) that our episcopate is not an "order" but an "office." And yet both these brethren insist with great positiveness that these authorities contradict "the practice" of the Church, namely, its ordination of bishops! Dr. Nesbit insists, therefore, that the ordination should be abolished to relieve the contradiction, and so leads the heroic movement. Dr. Merrill thinks the contradiction can be allowed to stand, and so takes no share in the "movement." But then the sweeping argument comes: if these authorities, in the very passages quoted, contradict the practice of our Church, *what are the authorities good for?* That "practice" was received from John Wesley; it is embodied in the history of our Church; it is expressed in her fundamental documents, and it forms a part of her constitution. To quote half a dozen writers who contradict the constitution of the Church as "the theory of the Church" is itself a contradiction; for the constitution of the Church is itself "the theory of the Church," and all those who contradict it are to be rejected as no authorities at all.

But the quotations themselves are mostly factitious and spurious. Of Dr. Nesbit's quotations, one is Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, as a Methodist authority! Another is a shamefully garbled sentence from Dr. Bangs, making him appear to say the reverse of what he does say. Another is from Dr. Stevens, written by him in his young manhood, and years ago rejected by him as an error.* Another is from Watson, who said that our episcopacy is not an order but an office, simply because he was unaware, as a foreigner, that our Discipline has always pronounced it both an "office" and "orders." Against these effigies we quote Wilbur Fisk, Emory, Bangs, Dr. Stevens, Dr. John S. Porter, and Dr. Alfred Brunson.

It is these editors themselves, observe, who stultify their own quoted authorities. Nothing is clearer than that those authorities themselves, as Watson, imagine that they are explaining and defending the "practice;" whereas, according to these editors, they really "contradict" and demolish the very thing they are trying to defend. Now we submit that authorities so stultified

---

* If Dr. Merrill, who hints that Dr. Stevens is *following* our opinions, will turn to the back volumes of our Quarterly, (since 1856,) he will find an article from the pen of Dr. Stevens defending our Methodist polity against an attack made in the so-called "prelatical" "Church Review," and he will find that Dr. Stevens's defense *against* "*prelacy*" is based on the very view maintained by us. And this view was pronounced by the "Church Review" to be "ultra-radical." So that, *first*, Dr. Stevens's views and ours were formed perfectly independently of each other; and, *second*, they are such as no "prelatist" would accept.

as that, (stultified even by those who quote them,) who overthrow what they try to defend, are a trifle worse than nothing; and to claim that their "theory" is to be imputed to the Church as its "theory," is to *stultify the Church.*

From the year 1785 to the year 1872 our Discipline in its First Section says in express words that Wesley gave to Coke "LETTERS OF EPISCOPAL ORDERS." What are *Letters of Episcopal* ORDERS? Of course they are written credentials announcing that Coke was authentically endowed by ordination with "EPISCOPAL ORDERS." Our fathers in that same *First Section* say that they accepted Coke and Asbury because they were "*satisfied of the validity of their Episcopal Ordination.*" All that can mean nothing else than that our founders required in the Episcopacy they chose a valid "*ordination,*" that Coke was endowed by a valid "ordination" with valid "orders," and that hence our Episcopate is valid "ORDERS." And this "Section" is a constitutive document. *It is the constitution of the Church declaring its own "theory."* To quote *sporadic dicta* from eminent individuals contradicting this declaration is to array them against the constitution of the Church. To "denounce" this declaration is to "denounce" our constitution, and to "inveigh against our discipline." And our Episcopal orders and ordination as defined by this declaration are embodied into our Restrictive Rule, and can be changed only by the Restrictive Rule process. *No one can, no one has attempted to, refute this argument.*

Dr. Nesbit (inadvertently followed by Dr. Merrill) makes a great show of triumph over an imaginary contradiction between our statements in our Commentary, of the nature of ordination as it existed in the Church of the Acts of the Apostles, and our statements in the Quarterly of the nature of ordination as optionally adopted by Wesley from "the primitive Church." Both sides of the fancied contradiction are true. The Church of the Acts of the Apostles was in a forming transitional state, and the ultimate import of ecclesiastical ordination not fixed; in the later or "primitive Church," whose form Mr. Wesley professedly adopted, three orders had very generally become established, and the ordination had received a fixed ecclesiastical import. How the forming Church of the Acts of the Apostles gradually crystallized into the "orders" of "the primitive Church," with its three ordinations, we indicate in our note on Acts xi, 30. It is the very force of "the Wesleyan axiom" that the Acts of the Apostles presents no obligatory model. This we unfolded at full as that, (stultified even by those who quote them,) who overthrow what they try to defend, are a trifle worse than nothing; and to claim that their "theory" is to be imputed to the Church as its "theory," is *to slander the Church.*

From the year 1786 to the year 1872 our Discipline in its First Section says in express words that Wesley gave to Coke "LETTERS OF EPISCOPAL ORDERS." What are *Letters of Episcopal Orders?* Of course they are written credentials announcing that Coke was authentically endowed by ordination with "EPISCOPAL ORDERS." Our fathers in that same *First Section* say that they accepted Coke and Asbury because they were "*satisfied of the validity of their Episcopal Ordination.*" All that can mean nothing else than that our founders rejoiced in the Episcopacy they chose a valid "ordination," that Coke was endowed by a valid "ordination" with valid "orders," and that hence our Episcopate is valid "ORDERS." And this "Section" is a constitutive document. *It is the constitution of the Church declaring its own "theory."* To quote *sporadic dicta* from eminent individuals contradicting this declaration is to array them against the constitution of the Church. To "denounce" this declaration is to "denounce" our constitution, and to "inveigh against our discipline." And our Episcopal orders and ordination as defined by this declaration are embodied into our Restrictive Rule, and can be changed only by the Restrictive Rule process. *No one can, no one has attempted to, refute this argument.*

Dr. Nesbit (inadvertently followed by Dr. Merrill) makes a great show of triumph over an imaginary contradiction between our statements in our Commentary, of the nature of ordination as it existed in the Church of the Acts of the Apostles, and our statements in the Quarterly of the nature of ordination as optionally adopted by *Wesley* from "the primitive Church." Both sides of the fancied contradiction are true. The Church of the Acts of the Apostles was in a forming transitional state, and the ultimate import of ecclesiastical ordination not fixed; in the later or "primitive Church," whose form Mr. Wesley professedly adopted, three orders had very generally become established, and the ordination had received a fixed ecclesiastical import. How the forming Church of the Acts of the Apostles gradually crystallized into the "orders" of "the primitive Church," with its three ordinations, we indicate in our note on *Acts* xi, 30. It is the very force of "the Wesleyan axiom" that the *Acts of the Apostles* presents no obligatory model. This we unfolded at full length in our article, and this jubilation over a pseudo-contradiction is as heedless as it is transient.*

We take no share in Dr. Merrill's fears that we are "imperiling the Episcopacy" by our thus blowing away the mist, and disclosing the genesis and nature of our polity precisely as it is. If the clear light of history destroys our Episcopacy, let it be destroyed. But, quite the reverse, such exposition, showing that this institution, cleared of all "contradiction," as received from John Wesley, is neither Prelacy nor Presbyterianism, but voluntary Episcopacy, defensible, as such, equally from high church and from anti-episcopal attacks, is as logical in "theory" as it is eligible in "practice." Of one thing our respected editorial brother may be well assured: after the expositions of this subject given in these our three Articles, *no mere General Conference majority will ever strike down John Wesley's Episcopal "ordination."* And when either our exposition, or any other light, shall convince two thirds of our General Conference, three fourths of our Annual Conferences, and a majority of our Lay Church, that our Episcopacy ought to cease, it will doubtless be for reasons which, however now unknown to us, will then be such as, if we are among the living, to command our acquiescence.

Dr. Merrill "cannot believe" that Mr. Wesley considered "the third ordination essential to the Bishop or Superintendent." That length in our article, and this justification over a pseudo-[illegible] is as needless as it is irrelevant?

---

* Our words in the special passage of our commentary quoted as contradictory are as follow:—The imposition of hands is here used to "ordain" these men, not to an "order," but to a mission.—The reader will observe that in this note the words "ordain" and "order" are put in quotations, as being quoted by us from those who adduce this imposition of hands as a proper ecclesiastical *ordaining to an order.* The note therefore denies that the ecclesiastical use of the word applies here. This "ordain" (so-called by the ecclesiastics) is not (as in the ecclesiastic use) to an "order," but to a mission. And then we add, "The rule that limits the laying on hands to special permanent orders is ecclesiastical rather than biblical." Just so in our Article, (p. 675,) "the word *order* is an ecclesiastical rather than a scriptural term," and we then proceed to define it in its ecclesiastical application, and its ecclesiastical limitation to permanent successional orders.

On the contrary, in the crystallizing Church of the Acts of the Apostles our note on Acts vi, 1 doubts if the ordination of the "seven" (deacons so-called) was to a permanent order; and our note on xxi, 18 doubts if James, Bishop of Jerusalem, was ever ordained. After all the care we took to show that these had no bearing upon the question what kind of an Episcopacy was derived from Mr. Wesley and enshrined in our Restrictive Rule, Dr. Nesbit's persistence in flaunting these pseudo-contradictions before his readers is pitiable enough. He was apparently led to his researches into our Commentary on this subject by our own reference thereto in our Article. Does he imagine that we would have referred from Article to Commentary if we had not the views of both harmoniously united in our mind as one harmonious whole?

We take no share in Dr. Merrill's fears that we are "imperilling the Episcopacy" by our thus throwing away the robe, and disclosing the genesis and nature of our polity precisely as it is. If the clear light of history destroys our Episcopacy, let it be destroyed. But, quite the reverse, such exposition, showing that this institution, cleared of all "contradiction," as [illegible] from which it sprang, is neither Prelacy nor Presbyterianism, but voluntary Episcopacy, defensible, as such, equally from high church and from anti-episcopal attacks, is as logical in "theory" as it is eligible in "practice." Of one thing our respected editorial brother may be well assured: after the expositions of this subject given in these our three Articles, no mere General Conference majority will ever strike down John Wesley's Episcopal "ordination." And when either our exposition, or any other light, shall convince two thirds of our General Conference, three fourths of our Annual Conferences, and a majority of our Lay Church, that our Episcopacy ought to cease, it will doubtless be for reasons which, however now unknown to us, will then be such as, if we are among the living, to command our acquiescence.

Dr. Merrill "cannot believe" that Mr. Wesley considered "the third ordination essential to the Bishop or Superintendent." What

---

*The words in the quoted passage of our Commentary quoted as contradictory are as follows:—"The imposition of hands is here used to "admit" those who are [illegible] to an "order," but to a ministry."—The reader will observe that in this note the words "admit" and "order" are not in quotation, as being quoted by us from those who [illegible] that imposition of hands is a proper [illegible] ecclesiastical [illegible] to orders. The note therefore denies that the ecclesiastical use of the word applies here. This "admit" [illegible] by the ecclesiastical [illegible] is not to an "order," but to a ministry. And then we add, "The rite, [illegible] (laying on hands) to special permanent orders is ecclesiastical rather than biblical." Just so in our Article, (p. 576,) "the word order is an ecclesiastical rather than a scriptural term," and we there proceed to define it in its ecclesiastical application, and its ecclesiastical limitation to permanent ecclesiastical orders.

On the contrary, in the [illegible] Church at the time of the Apostles our note on Acts vi, 3 doubts if the ordination of the "seven" (Deacons [illegible]) was to a permanent order; and our note on xxi, 18 doubts if James, Bishop of Jerusalem, was ever ordained. After all the care we took to show that these had a [illegible] upon the question what kind of an Episcopacy was derived from Mr. Wesley and maintained in our Restrictive Rule, Dr. Merrill's procedure in drawing these pseudo-contradictions before his readers is [illegible] strange. He [illegible] led us into [illegible] into our Commentary on this subject by our own [illegible] in our Article. Does he imagine that we would have referred them to our Commentary if we had not the [illegible] to both harmoniously [illegible] as our harmonious whole?

Mr. Wesley considered it necessary to some or every sort of a superintendent we do not suppose; but that he considered it necessary to an Episcopacy "after the practice of the primitive Church" is certain; for we have no example of a primitive Episcopal Church without the three ordinations. If he did not consider the ordination essential, why did he confer it? That ordination was a costly act to him. He knew beforehand the unparalleled storm, present and future, which that ordination would bring upon his head. It was one of the boldest, if not *the* boldest act of his life; yet he braved all the opposition heroically. Up to the full measure of that heroism was his estimate of the ordination. It was a price most certainly that with Dr. Merrill's views he never would have paid. And this is in full confirmation of the entire central granite argument of our last Article, (pp. 679–683,) proving the essential nature of our ordination; which argument Dr. Merrill quietly skips over as having no existence, yet persists in re-asserting the conclusion which that argument elaborately and most fully, as we think, explodes. According to Dr. M., Asbury, as "General Assistant," was a good enough Bishop for Mr. Wesley's views. And yet Dr. M. knows that until his ordination Asbury was never permitted, even at the risk of rebellion, to ordain an elder nor administer a sacrament. From all these considerations it seems to us that there is not the shadow of excuse for a doubt that Wesley considered ordination essential to *that* Episcopacy which he purposed to inaugurate—whether it was in some other or not. And so our fathers, as they testify in the First Section of the Discipline, (a Section our opponents persistently ignore,) declare that they accept this Episcopacy on account of the validity of its ordination; signifying thereby, that whether or not ordination be requirable for *any possible* Episcopacy, they did require it in the Episcopacy they purposed to accept.

Dr. Merrill, trying to prove that the General Conference has a right to abolish the ordination of Bishops, refers to the fact that they have already substituted the word "consecration" for "ordination." Now, 1. We have already shown Dr. M. (Oct. Quart., p. 674) that the words "ordination or consecration" are convertible terms; that "consecration" is so used by Coke and Asbury as quoted by us, p. 683; and that the General Conference has simply changed one synonym for another.* 2. No one doubts that, as in the case of Baptism or ordination of Elders, the General Conference may make incidental changes, but has it a right to

---

* Charles Wesley's charge against his brother was that he had "*consecrated* a Bishop."

Mr. Wesley considered it necessary to some or every sort of a superintendent we do not suppose; but that he considered it necessary to an Episcopacy "after the practice of the primitive Church," is certain; for we have no example of a primitive Episcopal Church without the three ordinations. If he did not consider the ordination essential, why did he confer it? That ordination was a costly act to him. He knew beforehand the unparalleled storm, present and future, which that ordination would bring upon his head. It was one of the boldest, if not *the* boldest act of his life; yet he braved all the opposition heroically. Up to the full measure of that heroism was his estimate of the ordination. It was a price most certainly that with Dr. Merrill's views he never would have paid. And this is in full confirmation of the entire (dotted) granite argument of our last Article, (pp. 673–683,) proving the essential nature of our ordinations; which argument Dr. Merrill quietly skips over as having no existence, yet persists in re-asserting the conclusion which that argument elaborately and most fully, as we think, explodes. According to Dr. M., Asbury, as "General Assistant," was a good enough Bishop for Mr. Wesley's views. And yet Dr. M. knows that until his ordination Asbury was never permitted, even at the risk of rebellion, to ordain an elder nor administer a sacrament. From all these considerations it seems to us that there is not the shadow of excuse for a doubt that Wesley considered ordination essential to *that* Episcopacy which he purposed to inaugurate—whether it was in some other or not. And so our fathers, as they testify in the First Section of the Discipline, (a Section our opponents persistently ignore,) declare that they accept this Episcopacy on account of the validity of its ordination; signifying thereby, that whether or not ordination be requirable for *any possible* Episcopacy, they did require it to the Episcopacy they purposed to accept.

Dr. Merrill, trying to prove that the General Conference has a right to abolish the ordination of Bishops, refers to the fact that they have already substituted the word "consecration" for "ordination." Now, 1. We have already shown Dr. M. (Qua. Quart., p. 674) that the words "ordination or consecration" are convertible terms; that "consecration" is so used by Coke and Asbury as quoted by us, p. 677; and that the General Conference has simply changed one synonym for another.* 2. No one doubts that, as in the case of Baptism or ordination of Elders, the General Conference may make incidental changes, but has it a right to

---

* Charles Wesley's charge against his brother was that he had "consecrated a Bishop."

abolish the ordinance of Baptism or the presbyterial ordination? 3. If our General Conference has "done away with" any constituent essential of our Episcopate, or of our Baptism, or of our presbyterial ordination, by a mere majority, it has violated the constitution of the Church, and should forthwith undo its wrong. But such wrong we deny that it has done. 4. What the essential constituents of our Episcopate are, and, therefore, what a General Conference may not "do away," we amply showed in our last Article, pp. 679–683. We showed that there were at any rate *four essential elements* in the Wesleyan Idea of Episcopacy embodied in our Restrictive Rule, and so drew the line between the incidental and the essential, the changeable by bare majority and the unchangeable. For Dr. Merrill to argue that either of these *four essentials* can be abolished by a bare majority, because that majority has made some verbal and incidental changes in the formula, is invalid reasoning.

We have now a very conclusive piece of evidence to present against the position of Drs. Nesbit, Curry, and Merrill, that a mere General Conference majority (without the concurrence of the annual conferences) can either abolish our episcopal ordination or shorten the life-tenure. Against this view of these brethren it has been our entire effort to show, 1. That our episcopal form of government was optional, and not a matter of faith; 2. That none of its essential constituents could be abolished without the consent of the annual conferences, according to the Restrictive Rule; and, 3. That ordination is one of those constituents requiring the concurrence of said annual conferences. The conclusive evidence of the truth of our positions against our three editorial brethren is furnished by a communication published in the "Christian Advocate" of November 23, 1871, signed "A Canadian Methodist." It seems that in 1837 it became important to our Canadian brethren, being involved in a lawsuit, to learn from our leading ministers what was the nature of our episcopate. Three inquiries were presented by their able representative, Rev. Egerton Ryerson, to Dr. Fisk and Bishop Hedding, in the following words:

> 1. Is episcopacy held by you to be a doctrine or matter of faith, or a form or rule of Church government, as expedient or not according to times, places, and circumstances?
>
> 2. Has the General Conference power, under any circumstances whatever, by and with the advice of all the annual conferences, to render the episcopal office periodically elective, and to dispense with the ceremony of ordination in the appointment thereto? And, as you were present at the British Conference in 1836 as the representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, I would beg to propose a third query:

3. Do you consider the ordination performed under the direction of the British Conference to be scriptural and Methodistical?

These three inquiries, it will be perceived, involve the very points which it has been our whole object to maintain against our three brother editors. Now what are the replies of Fisk and Hedding?

DR. FISK'S REPLY.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, MIDDLETOWN, CONN.,
November 20, 1837.

REV. EGERTON RYERSON: MY DEAR SIR,—Your favor of late date is before me, making some inquiries respecting the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The first was in reference to the episcopal form of government. I, as an individual, believe, and this is also the general opinion of our Church, that episcopacy is not a "doctrine or matter of faith"—it is not essential to the existence of a Gospel Church, but is founded on expediency, and may be desirable and proper in some circumstances of the Church and not in others.

You next inquire as to the power of the General Conference to modify or change our episcopacy. On this subject our Discipline is explicit, that "upon the concurrent recommendation of three fourths of all the members of the several Annual Conferences, who shall be present and vote on such recommendation, then a majority of two thirds of the General Conference succeeding shall suffice" to "change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away episcopacy *and* destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency." Of course, *with the above described majority the General Conference might make the episcopate office elective*,* and, if they chose, *dispense with the ordination* for the Bishop or Superintendent.

I was a delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Wesleyan Conference in England in 1836. At that Conference I was present at the ordination of those admitted to orders, and by request participated in the ceremony. I considered the ordination, as then and there performed, valid, and the ministers thus consecrated as duly authorized ministers of Christ.

With kind regards to yourself personally, and the best wishes for the prosperity of your Church, I am, as ever, yours in friendship and Gospel bonds, W. FISK.

The following is Bishop Hedding's answer to a similar letter to that addressed to Dr. Fisk:

LANSINGBURGH, N. Y., *October* 12, 1837.

DEAR BROTHER,—I have just arrived at home, and found your letter. I am sorry I did not receive it early enough to render the aid you wished. The Genesee Conference did not close till the 30th ult. I suppose the law case is decided, therefore any thing I write will be of no use. I would have tried to get to Kingston had I known the request at the Genesee Conference.

It is clear from the *proviso* added to the *restrictions* laid on the delegated General Conference, that by and with the supposed "*recommendation*" said Conference may alter the plan so as to make the episcopal office *periodically elective*, and also so as to *dispense with the ceremony of ordination* in the appointment.

I believe our Church never supposed the ceremony of ordination was necessary to the episcopacy; that is, that it could not in any possible circumstances be dispensed with; nor that it was absolutely necessary that one man should hold the episcopal office for life. One evidence of this I find in the Minutes of our Conference for the year 1789, four years after our Church was organized. There it is asked, "Who are the persons that exercise the episcopal office in the Methodist Church in Europe and America? *Answer. John Wesley*, Thomas Coke, Francis Asbury."—*Bound Minutes*, vol. i, p. 76. From this it appears those fathers considered Mr. Wesley in the episcopal office, though he had never been admitted to it by the ceremony

---

* Dr. Fisk here doubtless means, as Bishop Hedding explicitly expresses it, "periodically elective." In any other sense the Episcopate is "elective" now.

of ordination.* I shall be glad to know how the law case is decided. Please write me, or send me a paper containing it. My best respects to —— and her parents, your brothers, etc.

Dear brother, affectionately yours, ELIJAH HEDDING.

It will be seen at once that these letters affirm precisely our doctrine. 1. Our episcopacy is optional. 2. To change its time tenure requires the two thirds and three fourths vote, according to our Restrictive Rule. 3. To abolish ordination requires the same two thirds and three fourths vote. The same opinions were given by Dr. Luckey, and by Thomas Mason and George Lane. Nay, some of the very authorities quoted by our brethren opposite gave the same opinions, as Ezekiel Cooper, Thomas Morrell, Thomas Ware, and Nelson Reed. We think these authorities may settle the question. And it may here be added, once for all, that our opponents have not produced among all their quotations, nor can they produce, and they are hereby challenged to produce, *one authority affirming that after the passing of the Restrictive Rule it is permitted by the Restrictive Rule to abolish the ordination or life-tenure without the Restrictive Rule process.*

It is true, these opinions say nothing either way—as nothing was asked—as to whether our Discipline is right in attributing "orders" to our episcopate. That needs no confirmatory opinions. And some of these opinions imply (what we admit) that optionally we might have had an office of paramount jurisdiction without ordination or life-tenure, and call it a bishopric. But they do not affirm that such ever *was* the option of our fathers. On the contrary, these letters affirm that to the episcopate of their option (as we have abundantly shown) both ordination and life tenure were held constitutionally essential, not to be abolished without a constitutional three fourths vote of the annual conferences. That is, *Wesley optionally inaugurated, and our fathers optionally accepted and incorporated into our constitution, a life-tenured episcopate by ordination ;* until receiving which ordination Asbury was allowed to be only a General Assistant, and no sacraments were allowed to be administered by him or presbyterial ordinations to be conferred. And now we rejoice that these points are settled beyond rational dispute.

---

* So have we firmly maintained. (Oct. Quar., pp. 676-7.) But this passage in the Minutes occurs previous to the adoption of the Restrictive Rule; and Bishop Hedding quotes it to show what our fathers thought it competent for themselves at their option to frame into the Restrictive Rule, not what they optionally and actually *did* frame into it.

Miscellaneous.

Dogs and Their Doings. By Rev. F. O. Morris, B.A. Blue and gold. 8vo., pp. 184. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Melville Family and Their Bible Readings. By Mrs. Ellis. 16mo., pp. 232. Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter, & Co. 1871.

The August Stories. August and Elvie. By Jacob Abbott. 16mo., pp. 388. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1871.

Origin and History of the New Testament. By James Martin, B.A. 16mo., pp. 238. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1871.

The Thorough Business Man. Memoir of Walter Powell, Merchant. By Benjamin Gregory. 8vo., pp. 413. Melbourne and London: Strahan & Co. 1871.

The Old Back Room. By Jennie Harrison. 12mo., pp. 392. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1871.

Memoir of Rev. Patrick Copeland. By Edward D. Neill. 12mo., pp. 93. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

Park-street Pulpit. Sermons Preached by W. H. H. Murray. 8vo., pp. 372. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1871.

A Compendious Greek Grammar. By Alpheus Crosby, Professor in Dartmouth College. 12mo., pp. 370. New York: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co. 1871.

Diatessaron. The Life of our Lord, in the Words of the Gospel. By Frederick Gardiner, D.D., Professor in Berkeley Divinity School. 12mo., pp. 257. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1871.

Lectures on Satan. By Rev. Thaddeus M'Rae, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, M'Veytown, Pa. 16mo., pp. 173. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1871.

The Turning Wheel. By Paul Cobden. 16mo., green and gilt, pp. 364. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

The Cruise of the Casco. By Elijah Kellogg. 16mo., red and gilt, pp. 327. Illus- Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Aunt Madge's Story. By Sophie May. 16mo., red and gilt, pp. 215. Illustrated. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Life and Letters of Catherine M. Sedgwick. Edited by Mary E. Dewey. 12mo., pp. 446. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Among the Huts in Egypt. Scenes from Real Life. By M. L. Whateley. 12mo., pp. 344. London: Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday. 1871.

A Treatise on English Punctuation. Designed for Letter-writers, Authors, Printers, and Correctors of the Press. By John Wilson. 12mo., pp. 335. New York: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co. 1871.

Round the World. Including a Residence in Victoria, and a Journey by Rail across North America. By a Boy. Edited by Samuel Smiles, Author of "Self-Help," etc. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 289. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Border Reminiscences. By Randolph B. Marcy, U. S. Army, Author of "Prairie Traveler," etc. 12mo., pp. 396. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Hannah. A Novel. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," "A Brave Lady," "The Ogilvies," "Olive," "Agatha's Husband," etc. 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers.

My Wife and I; or, Harry Henderson's History. By Harriet Beecher Stowe. Illustrated by H. S. Stephens. 12mo., pp. 480. New York: J. B. Ford & Co.

◆

Notices of the following postponed to the next number:

Longfellow's Divine Tragedy. Osgood & Co.

Huntington's Church Idea. Hurd & Houghton.

Richmond's New York and Its Institutions. E. B. Treat.

Speaker's Commentary. Scribner & Co.

Smith's Ancient History of the East. Harper & Brothers.

Kingsley's At Last. Harper & Brothers.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1872.

ART. I.—THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND.—FIRST ARTICLE.

VERY early in the history of New England, institutions of learning were founded. In 1638, only eighteen years after the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, Harvard College was established, and in 1701 Yale College. In 1800 there were seven Colleges in New England, namely: Harvard, Yale, Brown University, Dartmouth, the University of Vermont at Burlington, Williams College, and Middlebury College, nearly as many as had been founded in all the other United States. In 1830 four others, Bowdoin, Waterville, (now Colby,) Amherst, and Washington, (now Trinity College,) had been established.

The Theological Schools of New England were among the first founded in this country; and, besides these, in 1830 New England had one hundred and sixty-three incorporated Academies for general education, and a large number which were unincorporated. It is our object to scrutinize, from data carefully collected from their published catalogues, the condition and prospects of these institutions in New England.

Commencing with the Colleges, we have three tables, giving the statistics of these institutions in 1830, 1850, and 1870.

COLLEGES—1830.

When Founded.	INSTITUTIONS AND LOCATION.	Students.	RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS.							
			Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	R. Island.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From out of New Eng'd.
1638	Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.	252	5	10	..	217	1	..	233	19
1701	Yale College, New Haven, Conn.	359	1	8	4	38	4	143	198	161
1764	Brown University, Providence, R. I.	105	1	4	4	62	25	1	97	8
1769	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.	137	4	90	22	17	..	..	133	4
1791	University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	39	..	1	28	..	..	8	32	7
1793	Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.	102	..	..	2	44	..	7	53	49
1797	Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.	86	..	..	54	2	..	1	57	29
1802	Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.	112	91	10	2	8	..	..	111	1
1820	Waterville College, Waterville, Me.	31	21	3	1	5	..	..	30	1
1821	Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.	207	2	9	7	132	..	16	166	41
1824	Washington College, Hartford, Conn.	64	..	..	8	4	4	27	38	26
1831	Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.	*48	..	..	..	..	..	..	23	25
	Total	1,542	125	135	127	529	34	198	1,171	371

* For the year 1831.

NOTE.—The author is indebted for a considerable part of this table to the American Quarterly Register for 1831.

COLLEGES—1850.

1638	Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.	*292	7	7	3	226	3	..	246	46
1701	Yale College, New Haven, Conn.	*418	8	8	3	68	2	110	199	219
1764	Brown University, Providence, R. I.	174	3	5	1	63	51	12	135	39
1769	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.	221	8	110	57	17	3	3	198	23
1793	Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.	179	..	6	13	54	..	9	82	97
1791	University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	101	..	..	76	2	..	..	78	23
1797	Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.	† 70	100	4	40	5	..	..	49	21
1802	Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.	120	..	10	..	4	..	..	114	6
1820	Colby University, Waterville, Me.	72	53	5	5	8	..	..	71	1
1821	Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.	182	8	11	7	98	3	13	135	47
1824	Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.	‡75	..	2	1	5	2	24	34	41
1831	Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.	116	5	8	5	20	..	20	58	58
1843	College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.	§ 34	..	..	..	34	..	..	34	..
	Total	2,054	187	176	211	604	64	191	1,433	621

* Scientific students not reckoned, See note under the table for 1870.

† For the year 1846–7.

‡ For the year 1851–52.

§ The whole number is 120. See reference under the table for 1870 for explanation.

COLLEGES—1870.

1638	Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.	608	22	18	8	397	6	4	450	158
1701	Yale College, New Haven, Conn.	522	6	3	1	88	3	142	193	329
1764	Brown University, Providence, R. I.	192	6	5	2	44	89	15	161	31
1769	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.	305	16	112	71	37	..	6	242	63
1797	Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.	* 49	..	2	34	1	..	1	38	11
1793	Williams' College, Williamstown, Mass.	141	1	..	7	30	..	4	42	99
1802	Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.	117	105	2	..	4	..	1	112	5
1820	Colby University, Waterville, Me.	55	50	1	..	1	1	..	53	2
1821	Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.	261	10	6	10	119	2	20	167	94
1791	University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	47	..	..	41	..	..	1	42	5
1824	Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.	89	8	1	..	4	3	18	29	60
1831	Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.	153	10	8	5	34	1	17	75	78
1843	College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.	† 41	1	4	3	23	2	2	35	6
1863	Boston College, Boston, Mass.	† 34	..	..	..	34	..	..	31	..
1864	Bates College, Lewiston, Me.	78	53	12	4	3	1	..	73	5
1865	Tuft's College, Medford, Mass.	61	7	..	9	39	..	..	55	6
	Total	2,753	290	174	190	808	108	231	1,801	952

* For the year 1871.

† These Roman Catholic institutions cover a course of academic and collegiate studies of seven years each, and have one hundred and thirty and one hundred and forty students each. The numbers given above are those who are pursuing the collegiate course.

NOTE.—In the above enumerations of students those pursuing scientific courses in Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Brown, and the University of Vermont are not reckoned; only those who are pursuing the regular course for the usual degree of A. B.

A careful inspection of the foregoing tables reveals a variety of interesting and important facts, which may be classified under several heads.

THE RELATIVE GROWTH OF THESE INSTITUTIONS.

In 1830 Yale College was the largest institution in New England in respect to the number of its students, having three hundred and fifty-nine, or one hundred and seven more than Harvard. In 1850 it still led, having four hundred and eighteen students, or one hundred and twenty-six more than Harvard. In 1870 Harvard led Yale by eighty-six students; but with their scientific students reckoned in, Yale still led Harvard by four students. The Boston Institute of Technology, with considerable more than two hundred students, so near to Harvard, has reduced the attendance upon her scientific department, Yale having one hundred and twenty-five scientific students to Harvard's thirty-five.

Brown University and Dartmouth College were established within five years of each other—in 1764 and 1769 respectively—the one in a large and flourishing city, the second in population in New England, and the other in a sparsely populated section, and very remote from the great centers and routes; but in 1830 Dartmouth led Brown, in the number of students, by only thirty-five; in 1850 by only forty-seven; while in 1870 her excess was one hundred and thirteen, and reckoning in the scientific students in each, Dartmouth led Brown by one hundred and sixty-four students. Is it said that Brown has to compete with other great Colleges in the sections around her? It may also be said that she is in the midst of the densest population of New England; and while Brown draws forty-four students from Massachusetts, Dartmouth, at a considerable distance away, draws thirty-seven, or nearly as many; and while Brown draws thirty-one students from out of New England, Dartmouth draws sixty-three. Rhode Island sends about the same number of students to Brown, in proportion to her population, that New Hampshire does to Dartmouth. It may be said that Dartmouth is situated on the border of Vermont, and draws seventy-one students from that State; but she does this notwithstanding Vermont has three colleges of her own, at

Burlington, Middlebury, and Northfield,* which indicates that she does it by reason of some superior, or at least more attractive, qualities.

The Vermont Colleges, it would seem, should be considered by themselves. We leave out of this classification the Norwich University on account of its almost purely scientific character, only three students, in 1870, pursuing the classical course, and only nine even the "Latin Scientific Course" of study. The University of Vermont, at Burlington, and Middlebury College—starting respectively in 1791 and 1797—have had quite irregular fortunes. In 1830 the Burlington institution had thirty-nine students and Middlebury had eighty-six students, or more than twice as many as the former. In 1850 Burlington had one hundred and one students to seventy at Middlebury, or a third more than the latter, Burlington having increased nearly threefold and Middlebury having declined sixteen students. In 1870 they were nearly equal, there being forty-seven students at Burlington to forty-nine at Middlebury, in the regular A. B. course, exclusive of twenty students in the scientific and agricultural course at Burlington. It is a remarkable fact, that even with this disparity of numbers against her, and the disadvantage of being situated further from the border than Burlington, Middlebury College has nevertheless always drawn a larger number of students from out of New England than the University of Vermont.

Williams College started twenty-eight years before Amherst, (1793 and 1821,) but has not kept pace with her younger sister. Although situated near the line of New York, and drawing from one half to two thirds of her students from out of New England in 1830 and in 1870, yet Amherst, less accessible from abroad, in each period has drawn nearly the same number of students from the same exterior territory. The principal advantage of Amherst has been that she has always received from three to four times as many students from Massachusetts, and also a very handsome complement from each of the other New England States. In 1830 Williams College, then thirty-seven years old, had one hundred and two students, and Amherst College, only nine years old, had two hundred and seven students. In 1870 Williams College had one hundred and

---

* Norwich University is now located in Northfield, Vt.

Burlington, Middlebury, and Northfield,* which indicates that she does it by reason of some superior, or at least more attractive, qualities.

The Vermont Colleges, it would seem, should be considered by themselves. We leave out of this classification the Norwich University on account of its almost purely scientific character, only three students, in 1870, pursuing the classical course, and only nine even the "Latin Scientific Course" of study. The University of Vermont, at Burlington, and Middlebury College—starting respectively in 1791 and 1797—have had quite irregular fortunes. In 1830 the Burlington institution had thirty-nine students and Middlebury had eighty-six students, or more than twice as many as the former. In 1850 Burlington had one hundred and one students to seventy at Middlebury, one-third more than the latter, Burlington having increased nearly threefold and Middlebury having declined sixteen students. In 1870 they were nearly equal, there being forty-seven students at Burlington to forty-nine at Middlebury, in the regular A. B. course, exclusive of twenty students in the scientific and agricultural course at Burlington. It is a remarkable fact, that even with this disparity of numbers against her, and the disadvantage of being situated further from the border than Burlington, Middlebury College has nevertheless always drawn a larger number of students from out of New England than the University of Vermont.

Williams College started twenty-eight years before Amherst, (1793 and 1821,) but has not kept pace with her younger sister. Although situated near the line of New York, and drawing from one half to two thirds of her students from out of New England in 1830 and in 1870, yet Amherst, less accessible from abroad, in each period has drawn nearly the same number of students from the same exterior territory. The principal advantage of Amherst has been that she has always received from three to four times as many students from Massachusetts, and also a very handsome complement from each of the other New England States. In 1830 Williams College, then thirty-seven years old, had one hundred and two students, and Amherst College, only nine years old, had one hundred and eighty students. In 1870, Williams College had one hundred and forty-one students, and Amherst two hundred and sixty-one students, or nearly twice as many. In 1850 the difference was only three students.

---

* Norwich University is now located in Northfield, Vt.

Maine has three institutions which belong in the regular class of Colleges—Bowdoin College, Colby University, formerly called Waterville College, and Bates' College—founded respectively in 1802, 1820, and 1864, besides the Agricultural College recently established at Orono. Bowdoin College has maintained a high rank, but has not realized a rapid growth, having in 1830, one hundred and twelve students; in 1850, one hundred and twenty students; in 1870, one hundred and seventeen students. Colby University had, in 1830, thirty-one students; in 1850, seventy-two students; in 1870, fifty-five students. This decrease in Bowdoin and Colby may be accounted for from the springing up of Bates College since 1864, which in 1870 had seventy-eight students, and perhaps, also, from the Agricultural College at Orono with thirty-one students.

Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, was founded under the name of Washington College, in 1824, and the Wesleyan University at Middletown, Connecticut, seven years later. There appears to be no reason why these institutions may not be compared together as to their growth. Trinity College had the advantage of previously occupying the field, a location in a larger and more thriving city, the natural and business center of the State, a direct railroad communication by the largest traveled routes, and the ample wealth and learning of an old and long-established denomination of great social culture and prestige to sustain it. Yet nevertheless, at a disadvantage in all these respects in her early history, which is too palpable to require statement, the Wesleyan University has been the more prosperous. In 1830 Trinity College had sixty-four students. The year following the Wesleyan University started with forty-eight students. In 1850 the former had seventy-five students and the latter one hundred and sixteen students; in 1870 the former had eighty-nine students and the latter one hundred and fifty-three students. It may also be said of both of these institutions that they are the only Colleges of their denominations in New England, and are situated only fifteen miles apart; and yet, while the Wesleyan University draws seventy-five students from New England and Trinity College twenty-nine students,

the number drawn from beyond New England by the Wesleyan University is nearly equal to the whole number of students in Trinity College.

A few other facts may be stated concerning the Wesleyan University. We give first a list of the number of students for each year in her history :

Year.	Students.	Year.	Students.	Year.	Students.
1831......	48	1845......	119	1859......	138
1832......	60	1846......	125	1860......	140
1833......	70	1847......	118	1861......	150
1834......	95	1848......	124	1862......	150
1835......	111	1849......	124	1863......	132
1836......	120	1850......	116	1864......	112
1837......	135	1851......	117	1865......	121
1838......	152	1852......	118	1866......	131
1839......	147	1853......	117	1867......	138
1840......	133	1854......	123	1868......	148
1841......	125	1855......	116	1869......	153
1842......	112	1856......	151	1870......	153
1843......	110	1857......	149	1871......	163
1844......	105	1858......	148		

It appears from this table that the Wesleyan University has now one hundred and sixty-three students, a larger number by ten than at any previous time in her history, and that she has been steadily rising to this point since 1867. In 1861 and 1862 she had one hundred and fifty students each year, followed by a decline during the war. In 1856 there were one hundred and fifty-one students, with nearly as many the two following years; and in looking over the preceding years we find that in 1838 there were one hundred and fifty-two students, a larger number than any year until within the last three years, more than thirty years later.

Reckoning by decades, we find the numbers as follows :

From 1831 to 1841 there were 1,071 students.
" 1841 " 1851 " 1,178 "
" 1851 " 1861 " 1,317 "
" 1861 " 1871 " 1,388 "
Increase in the second decade over the first................. 107
" third " " second 139
" fourth " " third 71

The relative decline in the fourth decade is probably owing to the war.

The College of the Holy Cross (Catholic) at Worcester, in 1850, in both its preparatory and collegiate departments, had

one hundred and twenty students to one hundred and forty in 1870; but in 1870 another Catholic College of the same character had been founded in Boston with one hundred and thirty students.

Tufts College is yet in its infancy, and had sixty-one students in 1870.

STUDENTS FROM OUT OF NEW ENGLAND IN THE NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES.

The superior character of the Colleges in New England has always attracted to them many students from the Middle, Southern, and Western States. Notwithstanding the recent increase of similar institutions in other sections of the Union, some of which are very large, and have many attractions and advantages, as Cornell and Michigan Universities, yet this tendency toward New England Colleges is steadily increasing, although not so rapidly since 1850 as before.

In 1830 twenty-three per cent. of the students in the New England Colleges came from beyond the bounds of New England; in 1850 thirty per cent.; in 1870 thirty-five per cent. The number of students from out of New England has been relatively larger in Williams College than in any other, being in 1830 forty-nine per cent., in 1850 fifty-four per cent., and in 1870 seventy per cent. Trinity College ranks next, having in 1830 forty per cent., in 1850 fifty-four per cent., in 1870 sixty-seven per cent. Yale College stands next, having in 1830 forty-four per cent., in 1850 fifty-two per cent., in 1870 sixty-three per cent. The Wesleyan University comes next in this class, having in 1850, and also in 1870, fifty per cent. of her students from out of New England. Amherst College in 1830 had nineteen per cent., in 1850 twenty-five per cent., in 1870 thirty-six per cent. from out of New England. Harvard College is the sixth in this class, having in 1830 seven per cent., in 1850 fifteen per cent., in 1870 twenty-six per cent. Then follow, in order, Middlebury College, Dartmouth, Brown University, and the University of Vermont. The three Maine Colleges draw only twelve students from out of New England.

These facts indicate that New England is looked to very extensively from all parts of our Union for superior educational one hundred and twenty students to one hundred and forty in 1870; but in 1870 another Catholic College of the same character had been founded in Boston with one hundred and thirty students.

Tufts College is yet in its infancy, and had sixty-one students in 1870.

STUDENTS FROM OUT OF NEW ENGLAND IN THE NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES.

The superior character of the Colleges in New England has always attracted to them many students from the Middle, Southern, and Western States. Notwithstanding the recent increase of similar institutions in other sections of the Union, some of which are very large, and have many attractions and advantages, as Cornell and Michigan Universities, yet this tendency toward New England Colleges is steadily increasing, although not so rapidly since 1850 as before.

In 1830 twenty-three per cent. of the students in the New England Colleges came from beyond the bounds of New England; in 1850 thirty per cent.; in 1870 thirty-five per cent. The number of students from out of New England has been relatively larger in Williams College than in any other, being in 1830 forty-nine per cent., in 1850 fifty-four per cent., and in 1870 seventy per cent. Trinity College ranks next, having in 1830 forty per cent., in 1850 fifty-four per cent., in 1870 sixty-seven per cent. Yale College stands next, having in 1830 forty-four per cent., in 1850 fifty-two per cent., in 1870 sixty-three per cent. The Wesleyan University comes next in this class, having in 1850, and also in 1870, fifty per cent. of her students from out of New England. Amherst College in 1830 had nineteen per cent., in 1850 twenty-five per cent., in 1870 thirty-six per cent. from out of New England. Harvard College is the sixth in this class, having in 1830 seven per cent., in 1850 fifteen per cent., in 1870 twenty-six per cent. Then follow, in order, Middlebury College, Dartmouth, Brown University, and the University of Vermont. The three Maine Colleges drew only twelve students from out of New England.

These facts indicate that New England is looked to very extensively from all parts of our Union for superior educational facilities, New England furnishing not quite two thirds of the students in her own Colleges.

In the above calculations we have adhered to our plan of reckoning only those students pursuing the regular course of study for the degree of A.B.

STUDENTS FROM EACH STATE IN THE NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES WHO ARE IN THE COLLEGES IN THEIR OWN STATES.

Of all the students who are in the New England Colleges—

From Maine, 61 per cent. is in Maine colleges.
From New Hampshire, 64 per cent. is in Dartmouth College.
From Vermont, 40 per cent. is in Vermont colleges.
From Massachusetts, 80 per cent. is in Massachusetts colleges.
From Rhode Island, 82 per cent. is in Brown University.
From Connecticut, 76 per cent. is in Connecticut colleges.

THE RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS AND THE COLLEGES IN NEW ENGLAND.

The Orthodox Congregationalists have, for more than forty years, had seven Colleges under their control in New England—Yale, Williams, Amherst, Bowdoin, Dartmouth, Middlebury, and the University of Vermont. The Baptists have had Brown University for a century, and Colby University since 1820. The Episcopalians have had only Trinity College since 1824, and the Methodists the Wesleyan University since 1831.

The proportion of College students to the communicants of these Churches in New England has been as follows:

Students from New England in the seven Congregational Colleges.

In 1850—845, or one student to 184 Congregational communicants.
In 1870—836, or one student to 228 Congregational communicants.

Students from New England in the two Regular Baptist Colleges.

In 1850—206, or one student to 437 Baptist communicants.
In 1870—214, or one student to 492 Baptist communicants.

Students from New England in the Episcopal College.

In 1850—34, or one student to 582 Episcopal communicants.
In 1870—29, or one student to 1,289 Episcopal communicants.

Students from New England in the Methodist College.

In 1850—58, or one student to 1,418 Methodist communicants.
In 1870—75, or one student to 1,561 Methodist communicants.

The Congregationalists had not quite as many students in their seven Colleges in 1870 as in 1850, and the same is true in regard to the Episcopalians, and all of these four denominations had less students in College in 1870, in proportion to their communicants, than they had in 1850.

If we make a comparison with the population we shall reach similar results. In 1850 there was one student from New England, in the Congregational Colleges, to three thousand two hundred and twenty-eight inhabitants; in 1870, one to four thousand one hundred and seventy-two inhabitants. In 1850 there was one student from New England, in Baptist Colleges, to thirteen thousand two hundred and forty-three inhabitants; in 1870 there was one to sixteen thousand two hundred and ninety-nine inhabitants. In 1850 there was one student from New England, in the Episcopal College, for eighty thousand two hundred and thirty-five inhabitants; in 1870 there was one to one hundred and twenty thousand two hundred and seventy-three inhabitants. In 1850 there was one student from New England, in the Methodist College, to forty-seven thousand and thirty-seven inhabitants; in 1870 there was one to forty-six thousand five hundred and five inhabitants.

Only one of these four denominations gained upon the population, in respect to the number of college students under their influence, and that was the Methodist Episcopal Church; but her gain was, however, quite small.

STUDENTS FROM NEW ENGLAND IN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.

There are several interesting and important inquiries. To what an extent are the young men of New England receiving a collegiate education? What portions of New England are doing the most for their young men? And how does the number of our young men in these Colleges compare with those of former periods, and also with the population at different periods?

It is impossible to accurately tell the number of young men from New England in institutions out of New England. In 1830 there were forty-two, or about three and a half per cent.; as many as there were from New England in New England Colleges. At that rate there would be at the present time

The Congregationalists had not quite as many students in their seven Colleges in 1870 as in 1860, and the same is true in regard to the Episcopalians, and all of these four denominations had less students in College in 1870, in proportion to their communicants, than they had in 1860.

If we make a comparison with the population we shall reach similar results. In 1860 there was one student from New England, in the Congregational Colleges, to three thousand two hundred and twenty-eight inhabitants; in 1870, one to four thousand one hundred and seventy-two inhabitants. In 1860 there was one student from New England, in Baptist Colleges, to thirteen thousand two hundred and forty-three inhabitants; in 1870 there was one to sixteen thousand two hundred and ninety-nine inhabitants. In 1860 there was one student from New England, in the Episcopal College, for eighty thousand two hundred and thirty-five inhabitants; in 1870 there was one to one hundred and twenty thousand two hundred and seventy-three inhabitants. In 1860 there was one student from New England, in the Methodist College, to forty-seven thousand and thirty-seven inhabitants; in 1870 there was one to forty-six thousand five hundred and five inhabitants.

Only one of these four denominations gained upon the population, in respect to the number of college students under their influence, and that was the Methodist Episcopal Church; but her gain was, however, quite small.

STUDENTS FROM NEW ENGLAND IN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.

There are several interesting and important inquiries. To what an extent are the young men of New England receiving a collegiate education? What portions of New England are doing the most for their young men? And how does the number of our young men in these Colleges compare with those of former periods, and also with the population at different periods?

It is impossible to accurately tell the number of young men from New England in institutions out of New England. In 1830 there were forty-two, or about three and a half per cent.; as many as there were from New England in New England Colleges. At that rate there would be at the present time about sixty-five students of this class. It probably does not exceed that number.

In 1870 there were one thousand eight hundred and one young men in New England Colleges from New England, pursuing a course of study for the usual degree of A.B., or one student for one thousand nine hundred and thirty inhabitants. But how was it with each State?

Maine fell below the average, sending one student to College for every two thousand and eighty-eight inhabitants. New Hampshire did better than the average, sending one for every one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six inhabitants. Vermont did better still, sending one for every one thousand seven hundred and thirty-nine inhabitants. Massachusetts did a little better than the average, but fell behind both New Hampshire and Vermont, sending one for every one thousand eight hundred and three inhabitants. Rhode Island fell behind, sending one for every two thousand and twelve inhabitants. Connecticut fell still more in the rear, sending one for every two thousand three hundred and twenty-six inhabitants.

THE DECLINE.

But when we come to consider the question of progress we find our eyes opened to startling facts, which will suggest other important inquiries. What are the prospects of collegiate education in New England, as indicated by the records of the past? Is the demand for it increasing or declining? And is the increase proportionate to the increase of the population?

Let us first look at New England as a whole. Taking the aggregate of the students from New England, in New England Colleges, pursuing the regular course for the degree of A.B., for 1830, 1850, and 1870, and comparing them with the population at each period, we find one student for one thousand one hundred and sixty-four inhabitants in 1830; one for one thousand four hundred and thirty-three inhabitants in 1850; and one for one thousand eight hundred and one inhabitants in 1870. Here is indicated a very marked decline; for in 1870 it required fifty-four per cent. more inhabitants to furnish one student for a regular college course of study than it did in 1830. It indicates that the popular demand for col-about sixty-five students of this class. It probably does not exceed that number.

In 1870 there were one thousand eight hundred and seven young men in New England Colleges from New England, pursuing a course of study for the usual degree of A. B., or one student for one thousand nine hundred and thirty inhabitants. But how was it with each State?

Maine fell below the average, sending one student to College for every two thousand and eighty-eight inhabitants. New Hampshire did better than the average, sending one for every one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six inhabitants. Vermont did better still, sending one for every one thousand seven hundred and thirty-nine inhabitants. Massachusetts did a little better than the average, but fell behind both New Hampshire and Vermont, sending one for every one thousand eight hundred and three inhabitants. Rhode Island fell behind, sending one for every two thousand and twelve inhabitants. Connecticut fell still more in the rear, sending one for every two thousand three hundred and twenty-six inhabitants.

THE DECLINE.

But when we come to consider the question of progress we find our eyes opened to startling facts, which will suggest other important inquiries. What are the prospects of collegiate education in New England, as indicated by the records of the past? Is the demand for it increasing or declining? And is the increase proportionate to the increase of the population?

Let us first look at New England as a whole. Taking the aggregate of the students from New England, in New England Colleges, pursuing the regular course for the degree of A. B., for 1830, 1850, and 1870, and comparing them with the population at each period, we find one student for one thousand one hundred and sixty-four inhabitants in 1830; one for one thousand four hundred and thirty-three inhabitants in 1850; and one for one thousand eight hundred and one inhabitants in 1870. Here is indicated a very marked decline; for in 1870 it required fifty-four per cent. more inhabitants to furnish one student for a regular college course of study than it did in 1830. It indicates that the popular demand for collegiate education is only half as large as it was forty years ago, and that therefore the unoccupied field is relatively a little more than twice as large as it was then. But let us analyze the field and ascertain where the deficiency is.

Maine, although in 1870 behind the average, nevertheless, in respect to progress, has a better record than some of her sister States, having steadily advanced from one student to three thousand two hundred inhabitants in 1830, to one for three thousand one hundred and eighteen inhabitants in 1850, and to one for two thousand and eighty-eight inhabitants in 1870. New Hampshire had one student to two thousand inhabitants in 1830; one to one thousand eight hundred and seven inhabitants in 1850; one to one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six inhabitants in 1870—a creditable gain from 1830 to 1850; but during the last twenty years, while the population actually increased only three hundred and twenty-four, there was an actual decrease of two in the number of students in the New England Colleges from that State. Vermont, in 1830, had one student for two thousand two hundred and ten inhabitants; in 1850, one for one thousand four hundred and eighty-eight inhabitants; in 1870, one for one thousand seven hundred and thirty-nine inhabitants—a very great advance from 1830 to 1850, but a decline since 1850. Massachusetts in 1830 had one student for one thousand one hundred and fifty-three inhabitants; in 1850, one for one thousand six hundred and forty-four inhabitants; in 1870, one for one thousand eight hundred and three inhabitants—a steady decline. Rhode Island in 1830 had one student for two thousand eight hundred and five inhabitants; in 1850, one for two thousand three hundred and five inhabitants; in 1870, one for two thousand and twelve inhabitants—a steady advance. Connecticut in 1830 had one student for one thousand five hundred and three inhabitants; in 1850, one for one thousand nine hundred and forty-one inhabitants; in 1870, one for two thousand three hundred and twenty-six inhabitants—a steady decline.

In relative progress, during the last forty years, Maine leads; next follows Rhode Island; then Vermont, although during the last twenty years there has been a retrogression; next New Hampshire, although she has stood nearly stationary during the last twenty years; while there has been a very marked relative

decline in both Massachusetts and Connecticut, each State having about eight hundred more inhabitants to each student which it has in college than in 1830.

Such is the state of the field. Can any thing be said by the way of accounting for this condition of things?

THE INCREASE OF POPULATION.

It should not be overlooked that in the two States just referred to, in which this relative decline is so marked, there has been a large increase of population, especially during the last twenty years. While the population of all New England has increased seven hundred and fifty-nine thousand eight hundred and one since 1850, six hundred and twenty-nine thousand four hundred and forty-nine of it, or eighty-two per cent. of the whole, has been in the two States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. During the same period the population of Maine increased seven per cent., Vermont five per cent., and New Hampshire one tenth of one per cent., while that of Massachusetts increased forty-six per cent., and of Connecticut forty-five per cent. But it should also be noticed that the population of Rhode Island at the same time increased forty-seven per cent., or one per cent. more than that of Massachusetts, and yet she made an advance in her proportion of collegiate students from one for two thousand three hundred and five inhabitants in 1850, to one for two thousand and twelve inhabitants in 1870, so that this great increase of population in Massachusetts and Connecticut cannot be regarded as an obstacle in the way of collegiate growth. It is really, in itself, favorable to it.

THE INCREASE OF THE FOREIGN-BORN INHABITANTS CONSIDERED.

But it will be said that a very large part of this increase of population in Massachusetts and Connecticut is from immigration, and consequently heterogeneous, and not easily lifted up into just conceptions of intellectual culture. It must be admitted that this is an important factor, which must not be overlooked. But let us understand the case fully.

Let it, however, first be borne in mind that the table for 1870 gives seventy-five students in Catholic Colleges in Massachusetts to thirty-four in 1850, an increase of a little more than one hundred per cent. It should also be noticed that in almost all the New England Colleges there are sons of foreign parentage, and students who were themselves foreign born.

But this increase of foreign-born population is an important matter. A careful analysis and calculation upon the recent official returns of the United States Census* shows, that while the native population of New England increased only seventeen per cent. from 1850 to 1870, the foreign-born inhabitants increased one hundred and fourteen per cent. during the same period; but these figures might mislead some minds without another statement of the case. The *actual* increase of the native population was four hundred and fourteen thousand two hundred and twenty-five, and of the foreign born three hundred and forty-five thousand three hundred and fifty-two.

Now we believe that this large foreign element, increasing so rapidly among us, does not either excuse the marked relative decline in collegiate education in Massachusetts and Connecticut, or show that the field is not a desirable or an important one to occupy; for we have noticed that Maine, during this period, increased her proportion of college students in New England Colleges from one to three thousand one hundred and eighteen inhabitants in 1850 to one to two thousand and eighty-eight inhabitants in 1870, notwithstanding her native population increased only twenty-six thousand and ninety, or five per cent., and her foreign population increased seventeen thousand six hundred and eighty-two, or fifty-six per cent., at the same time. We have also seen Rhode Island increasing her college students from one for two thousand three hundred and five inhabitants in 1850 to one for two thousand and twelve inhabitants in 1870; but her native population increased thirty-eight thousand three hundred and fourteen, or thirty-three per cent., and her foreign-born inhabitants thirty-one thousand four hundred and ninety-two, or one hundred and thirty-two per cent., during the same period. And it must be remembered that Connecticut, with an increase of seventy-

---

* These investigations have been based upon the "advanced sheets" of the United States Census for 1870, recently sent out.

eight thousand one hundred and twenty-one, or two hundred and twenty per cent., in her foreign-born population during the last twenty years, had also a native increase of eighty-seven thousand nine hundred and fifty-one, or twenty-six per cent., and Massachusetts, with an increase of one hundred and eighty-nine thousand two hundred and ninety-five, or one hundred and fifteen per cent., in her foreign-born population, had also at the same time a native increase of two hundred and seventy-three thousand five hundred and forty-two, or thirty-three per cent., the same ratio of native increase as that of Rhode Island, while the relative increase of the foreign born was a little greater in Rhode Island than in Massachusetts.

The conclusion then is, that inasmuch as Maine and Rhode Island advanced upon their population in the number of their college students, the reason why Massachusetts and Connecticut did not do so is not to be accounted for either on the ground of the increase of population, or from the fact that that increase is so largely foreign born.

◆

ART. II.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

IN various discussions concerning Mr. Wesley's ordination of Dr. Coke, and the action of the Baltimore Conference of 1784, right conclusions are reached, and yet it is not always made to appear as clearly as it might be that those conclusions are based, squarely and immovably, on the true foundation. The principles which govern the case are not always brought directly into view; and, even when cited, are not seldom thrust speedily into the background and seemingly forgotten. John Wesley evidently saw the great foundation-stone when he said, alluding to Stillingfleet, "I think that he has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor his apostles prescribe any particular form of church government." Dr. Stillingfleet points directly at the corner-stone itself when he says, "I assert any particular form of government agreed on by the governors of the Church, consonant to the general rules of Scripture, to be

by divine right; that is, God, by his own laws, hath given men a power and liberty to determine the particular form of church government among them."—*Irenicum*, p. 41. In the Church, as well as the State, government is divinely sanctioned, but no one form of organization is prescribed as of universal obligation. If the people, at any given period of their history, are convinced that a civil monarchy will best promote the public welfare, they have a right to establish it; if they believe that a republic will in the largest degree promote the public good, they have a right to establish a republic. So in the Church of God: organization is needful that order may be maintained, and that the great work of the Church may be prosecuted faithfully and efficiently; but it is left to the conscientious judgment of the Church itself to determine what form of organization is best suited to the times in which it lives, and the field in which it works. This principle being conceded, certain specific conclusions follow:

1. That different forms of church organization, existing at the same time in different sections of the Christian body, or existing at different times in the same Christian communion, may be equally valid and equally binding upon the individual members of that community.

2. That in every body of Christians, providentially separated and set by themselves, there inheres the right and the authority to organize a church government where none as yet exists, or to modify the form of government under which they are living.

It may not always be easy to tell how this power is to be exercised. It may be impossible to frame set rules showing the precise time when effort to secure changes becomes allowable. It may be difficult to define beforehand who should lead in constructive movements; nevertheless, the right and the power exist in every body of Christians, and the time may come when to refuse to act is disloyalty to God and the true Church of God. This right is not license and anarchy. It is hedged about on every side by limitations which men disregard at their peril. Nothing must be set aside which is clearly enjoined in the Scripture. Nothing must be adopted which is clearly contrary to the letter or the spirit of the Scripture. All must be done with a single eye to the glory of God and the by divine right; that is, God, by his own laws, hath given men a power and liberty to determine the particular form of church government among them."—*Irenicum*, p. 41. In the Church, as well as the State, government is divinely sanctioned, but no one form of organization is prescribed as of universal obligation. If the people, at any given period of their history, are convinced that a civil monarchy will best promote the public welfare, they have a right to establish it; if they believe that a republic will in the largest degree promote the public good, they have a right to establish a republic. So in the Church of God; organization is needful that order may be maintained, and that the great work of the Church may be prosecuted faithfully and efficiently; but it is left to the conscientious judgment of the Church itself to determine what form of organization is best suited to the times in which it lives and the field in which it works. This principle being conceded, certain specific conclusions follow:

1. That different forms of church organization, existing at the same time in different sections of the Christian body, or existing at different times in the same Christian community, may be equally valid and equally binding upon the individual members of that community.

2. That in every body of Christians, providentially separated and set by themselves, there inheres the right and the authority to organize a church government where none as yet exists, or to modify the form of government under which they are living.

It may not always be easy to tell how this power is to be exercised. It may be impossible to frame set rules showing the precise time when effort to secure changes becomes allowable. It may be difficult to define beforehand who should lead in constructive movements; nevertheless, the right and the power exist in every body of Christians, and the time may come when to refuse to act is disloyalty to God and the true Church of God. This right is not license and anarchy. It is hedged about on every side by limitations which men disregard at their peril. Nothing must be set aside which is clearly enjoined in the Scripture. Nothing must be adopted which is clearly contrary to the letter or the spirit of the Scripture. All must be done with a single eye to the glory of God and the good of men; nothing through caprice, passion, insubordination, pride of opinion, self-seeking, or ambition. They who enter upon the duty of framing or amending forms of church organization must not only bring holy hands to the work, but must employ their highest intelligence in it, asking the wisdom that cometh from above that their action may be such as shall best secure the peace and safety of the flock of Christ, and best enable the Church to reach and save the world. And when those in whom resides the right to act in the case have acted, in the due exercise of their godly judgment, and within the limitations named, and a system of church order has been established in which there is nothing contrary to the Scripture, and the work has been done wisely and intelligently, meeting the wants of the people and of the age, and showing itself powerful for good in the field which providentially falls to it, then that organization has a divine right to be, and that Christian body is, an integral part of the true Church of God. And wherever a body of believers, providentially set by themselves, thus unite in holy fellowship for mutual aid and sympathy, the maintenance of the ordinances of religion, and the prosecution of Christian work, that organization is not subject to the control of any other Church, but contains within itself, by the divine will, all needed authority to proceed in its labors of love, and to supply what may be lacking in its instrumentalities. In fine, God's Church grows directly out of God's word; and as plants propagated by cuttings, whether taken from the twig or the root, sometimes degenerate and tend to die out; as the worn-out peach tree grows barren and short-lived, and the worn-out potato rots in the ground, and the cultivator is compelled to resort to the seed to secure a new succession, endowed with new vital forces, so church organizations sometimes lose their vitality and cease to be available for their great mission, and the Lord of the harvest starts new ones from the seed.

These, then, are the general principles which are applicable to the work of church organization. In applying them to the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church three questions present themselves:—

1. Did the American Methodists, in 1784, have a right to organize as a Church?

2. Did those who acted in the organizing of the Methodist Episcopal Church have a right to act in the case?

3. Did they in any way so lapse from Scripture rules as to render their work of doubtful validity?

The answer to the first question does not seem difficult to find. The American Methodist societies were from the first separate from all the other Christian bodies of the land. Some of their members did indeed apply, occasionally, to the ministers of the Episcopal Church for admission to the Lord's Supper, or for the baptism of a child, just as a stranger now comes to any minister of the Gospel to ask him to perform the marriage ceremony or conduct a funeral service; but no pastoral authority was claimed on the one side or acknowledged on the other. Moreover, when the Revolution came, the Church of England ceased to exercise, or even claim, jurisdiction over the Episcopal Churches of the colonies, and left them without organization, and as they seemed to conclude, without the power to organize. There were Congregational, Presbyterian, and Baptist Churches at hand, but they had no shadow of authority over the Methodist societies, for these societies were certainly not indebted, in any degree, for their existence or their success, either to the active labors or the kindly sympathies of their ecclesiastical neighbors. There was no American Church out of which the Methodists had grown, or from which they had rent themselves away; there was none with which they were under obligations to unite, or with which they could unite, even if they had been eager so to do. Their zealous opponents denounced them as teachers of false doctrine and intruders upon other people's territories, and sometimes even as enemies of their country; but no one dreamed of charging them with *schism*. The Methodists were made a separate and distinct people, not by the mere accident of a separate origin, but by the doctrines which they delighted to preach, the religious experience which they cultivated, the peculiar plans of labor which they had adopted, and the energy and self-sacrifice with which they toiled for God and souls. The great Head of the Church seems to have called them out and set them by themselves for special work.

The Methodist body, thus independent of all others, and opposed and rejected by them, was developing a wonderful

spiritual power, and accomplishing, under God, wonderful results. Multitudes were brought from darkness to light. True converts, changed not only in their opinions but in heart and in life, came "as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows." Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor, the first missionaries sent by Wesley, landed on the American shores in 1769, and fifteen years thereafter eighty-one faithful evangelists were toiling in the gospel field, and fifteen thousand members were enrolled as the fruit of their earnest ministry.

It was evident, too, that the work was just begun. The success already given was not the victory in which these spiritual warriors were to rest, but only the "sound of the going in the tops of the mulberry trees" calling them to battle. These ministers of God, when they gathered in the memorable Conference of 1784, were not like so many reapers coming home weary at eventide, the last rays of the fading twilight guiding their way, and the last sheaves of the gleaning loading their wains. They stood rather in their strength, sickle in hand, amid the growing light and the early dew of the morning, while far away on every side stretched the golden harvest in endless perspective.

The work of the early Methodist evangelists was not only important but peculiar. None but they were doing it, and to human wisdom it would seem that none but they could do it. This work must go on. With the wide field opening before them, and a divine voice calling, they dared not cease from their labors; they dared not disband. To do this would be to prove false to every inner conviction, and to every outward token of duty. But the obligation to do the work involves the right to plan the work, to map out the field, assign the places of the workmen, and establish the rules necessary to secure harmony and efficiency of effort. In a word, the societies were divinely called to organize and equip themselves for all Church duties and responsibilities; and they had a divine right so to do.

We reach the same conclusion from another point of departure. One of the fundamental principles of Protestantism is, that all true piety is the result of honest conviction, and consequently, in matters purely religious, not only is coercion

wholly out of place, but that every man should regard it as a right and a duty to read God's word, and learn for himself what it teaches. There is a point, indeed, beyond which "no stranger intermeddleth." In the silent depths of the soul—in the inmost recesses of being—God and man meet, and there, whither no human voice can penetrate, no human hand reach, the controversy goes on, and the great question of life and death is determined. The Bible is God's voice to men. Each is entitled to the privilege of hearing it with his own ears. The Papist declaims against private judgment in matters of religion as a most perilous thing, but there is no judgment at all except private judgment. Rome assures me that I cannot understand the Gospel till an infallible pope has explained it to me. But how am I to understand the pope? My only choice is, whether I shall exercise private judgment on the text or the comment; on what God says, or what man says that God says. And who will dare to tell us that the comment is better than the text? And if Peter was the first pope, and all the popes are Peters, how does it happen that the first Peter is an unintelligible and dangerous teacher of the people, and the last one is plain and safe?

But if men read the Scriptures for themselves they may differ in their interpretations. The history of the Church seems to indicate that diversity of opinion is inseparable from religious freedom. The religious opinions of different men are sometimes not only divergent, but even logically antagonistic. And there are limits within which men may differ not only without forfeiting the divine favor, but without dimming their luster as lights of the world, or lessening the practical value of their piety. They may differ so widely that while they do not lack Christian regard for each other, they cannot work together with advantage. Paul and Barnabas so differed in judgment in respect to a practical matter that they separated, and each went his own way. We may wonder that both of them should be so unyielding, nevertheless we do not question the piety of either; nor can we fail to note the fact that the "contention" which arose between them gave rise to no bitterness of spirit on either side, but merely sent them off in different directions, and thus gave a wider range to their ministry of life and salvation.

Thus good men are liable at any time to form such diverse opinions in regard to religious doctrine, or church government, or plans of doing the work of the Church, that there is more of utility and even of true unity in amicable separation than in ill-yoked fellowship. The right to deal with the greater implies the right to deal with the less. If we have the right to judge for ourselves in regard to the nature of God, the plan of salvation, human duty and human destiny, surely we are not treading on dangerous ground when we venture to discuss forms of church organization, or decide whether duty demands that we found a new organization. If it be true, therefore, that men are accountable to God, and not to each other, for their religious views—if the grand Protestant principle of religious freedom is sound—then we must conclude that any body of Christian men, agreeing in regard to doctrine and church usages, and desirous of forming a closer union among themselves, have, by the will of God, a right to judge of the time when they are called to carry their plans into effect. If the American Methodists had a right to adopt and maintain the peculiar opinions which they held, they had a right to organize all needed agencies for the spread of those doctrines. From the great Protestant principle of religious freedom it follows that the Methodists of 1784 had a scriptural right to organize as a Church, and the ecclesiastical edifice which they erected is not built on the sands of human caprice, but is founded on the living Rock, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

But was the Methodist Church organized by those who had a right to act in the case? Stillingfleet, as already cited, affirms that any form of government, "agreed on by the governors of the Church," and consonant with the general rules of the Scripture, exists by divine right. But who are the governors of the Church? In the case of the Methodist societies, who had a right, legal, natural, moral, or scriptural, to take part in the work of organization? It is easy to point in certain directions where no shadow of right existed, and whence even advice, to say nothing of criticism, would be an impertinence. The constitution of the United States has set the Church forever free from the control of the State, and the civil law interposed no obstacle in the way of the contemplated work. The

Episcopal Churches of the country could claim no authority either to help or hinder, for they were in a state of utter confusion, and almost of wreck, with no bond of union among themselves, and at a loss even for a plan of union. The other Churches of the country had no right to utter a word or lift a finger. The Church of England could have no voice in the matter, notwithstanding the fact that the Wesleyan movement began within her pale, because she exacts of her clergy an oath of allegiance to the English sovereign as the head both of the Church and the State; and no American could take such an oath.

The only persons, therefore, that could righteously claim a place among the framers of the plan of organization were John Wesley, the eighty-one preachers, and the fifteen thousand members of the American societies. Wesley, as he himself said, had grown into a true bishop, not through any far-seeing ambition on his part, but by the providence of God; and it would have been unwise as well as ungrateful for the American Methodists not to ask his counsel and co-operation. The preachers, who were bearing the burden and heat of a day of hardest toil, poverty, and self-sacrifice, were certainly entitled to a place among those who were laying the foundations of the Church; and the people had rights which no just or wise man would be willing to see disregarded. In the formularies given in our ritual for the ordination of elders and the consecration of bishops, the office is declared to be committed to the elder or bishop elect, "by the authority of the Church." Who would venture to say that the Church consists of the ministry alone, and that the laity are no part thereof? To show precisely how much authority rightly belonged to each of these three parties—Mr. Wesley, the preachers, and the people—to say whose counsels ought to have prevailed in case there had been a conflict of opinion, might not be easy questions to settle; but we are happily saved from the necessity of attempting to settle them by the fact that all these parties concurred with the most complete and hearty unanimity. Mr. Wesley had been repeatedly importuned by both preachers and people to devise measures whereby the American societies could become a regularly organized Church, with a government of its own, and a ministry who should perform all the

duties of the sacred office. When he judged that the time had come for the doing of this work he prepared a plan which was essentially episcopal in its form. Knowing the desires of the preachers and the people, he proceeded to solemnly set apart Dr. Thomas Coke for the office of a superintendent or bishop, directing him in like manner to ordain Francis Asbury. The preachers, assembling in the Conference of 1784 for the purpose of completing the work of organization, felt that no small part of the responsibility devolved upon them, and took action accordingly. When Dr. Coke presented himself before them, and the letter of Mr. Wesley was read, there was no usurpation of authority on the one side nor blind submission on the other. The question was put, in parliamentary form, whether Dr. Coke should be accepted as the Superintendent of the Methodist societies under their new name of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the vote was unanimously in favor. Mr. Asbury was also elected by a unanimous vote. In like manner the entire plan of Church polity was adopted and established without a dissenting voice. The laity, indeed, were not present to bear a part in the formal action of the Conference; but it was well understood that the ministry and the people were a unit in their views and purposes. Referring to the general approval with which these proceedings were hailed, Ezekiel Cooper, who was present at the conference, remarks that "we shall seldom find such unanimity of sentiment upon any question of such magnitude." No one outside the circle named—John Wesley, the eighty-one preachers, and the fifteen thousand members in society—had the semblance of a right to say what form of organization the American Methodists should adopt. All inside that circle concurred with enthusiastic unanimity; consequently there was no disregard of the rights of any one concerned, no assumption of imaginary authority. No unlawful hand was laid upon our ecclesiastical ark.

We now come to the third question: Did those who established the Methodist Episcopal Church so lapse in any way from Scripture rules as to render their work of doubtful validity?

In the judgment of adverse critics our ecclesiastical structure has one defective spot, which is, as they state it, our lack of valid successional ordination. We do not design to review

the long and weary war of words which has been waged on the general subject. Ponderous volumes have been written; some to prove that no hands but those of a bishop convey authority in the Church of God, and that there must be an unbroken succession of these layings on of hands from apostolic times; others, to show that ordination by the hands of elders is equally authoritative. Much of this debate has spent itself upon the mere surface of the question.

The Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church goes down to the root of the matter. It asks, "How is a bishop to be constituted?" The answer given is, "By the election of the General Conference, and the laying on of the hands of three bishops, or at least of one bishop and two elders." In like manner, an elder is constituted "by the election of a majority of an annual conference, and by the laying on of the hands of a bishop and some of the elders that are present." A deacon must be elected by the annual conference, and ordained by a bishop. But if at any time there should be no bishop in the Church, the General Conference shall elect one, and the elders ordain him, and thus renew the line. Here, then, are two things, election and ordination, or consecration, whereby a bishop, an elder, or a deacon is constituted in our Church. But of the two, which is principal and which accessory? Which part is essential? Which part may be modified, or done away? It does not require much reflection to make it manifest that the essential element is a valid election. The candidate must not only be called of God to the holy work, but this call must be seconded by the solemn judgment of the Church, given either in general assembly or by her representatives. This is expressly affirmed in the forms provided in our ritual for the consecration of bishops and the ordination of elders. In the consecration of a bishop the language used is, "The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the authority of the Church, through the imposition of our hands." The same expression occurs in the form for the ordination of elders. The sacred office belongs to him whom the Church has solemnly called to the work, and to him alone. The rite of ordination, performed without the sanction of the Church, conveys no authority in the Church. The doctrine that the election of the

minister is nothing, and that ordination is every thing, was unknown in the early history of the Christian Church. Matthias was the first minister constituted by the Church in her organic capacity, and he seems to have been named for the sacred office in an assemblage composed of the whole body of believers at Jerusalem. Stephen and the other deacons were chosen by the people. The testimony of Clemens Romanus, Cyprian, and Chrysostom shows beyond dispute that, in their day, the laity had a potential voice in the selection of the clergy. It was left to succeeding ages to lose sight of great principles, and hide usurpation under a vail of showy ceremonies.

What force or value, then, inheres in ordination? The Romish theory teaches that ordination is a true sacrament; that where it is rightly conferred it imparts, *opere operato*, peculiar grace to the recipient; that without it there can be no authority to perform the duties of the office, no validity in official services performed; and that, without the laying on of the hands of one who has himself been validly ordained, no official authority can be conferred. Some, not of the Romish Church, do not call ordination a sacrament, and yet hold that an unbroken line of episcopal ordinations is an essential element of a true gospel ministry. This theory, both in the Romish form and the "High Church" modification, leads directly to Rome, inasmuch as it logically implies the organic unity of the Church. It is not difficult to make this appear.

An accredited minister is such by virtue of the authority of the Church which has placed him in the sacred office. If he severs his connection with the Church he surrenders his commission. He cannot, at the same time, be independent of the Church and remain a part of it. It is self-contradictory and absurd to say, that I cannot indeed become a minister without the action of the Church, but, having become one to-day by such action, that I may to-morrow renounce and defy the Church, and still hold my office by a valid tenure. Every minister who secedes from the ecclesiastical body which gave him his office surrenders his commission. The rules of all the various denominations recognize this fact. Our own law is clear. If a minister of another Church desires to unite with us, he has no authority to preach or to administer the sacraments until the Church, by the conference, has acted in his case.

His previous position may be accepted as proof of certain general qualifications; a second laying on of hands may not be had; but he cannot perform the office of an elder among us until the conference has voted on his case, in precisely the same manner in which a vote is taken in the election of our own elders. In a word, he is not a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church till he is constituted such by regular church action.

Thus every secession and schism, whether involving one man only or more, of necessity vacates all derived authority. As in civil affairs, when a colony repudiates the rule of the mother country, and declares its independence, all commissions given by the home government become void, and the entire administration must be reconstructed on the new basis, so, when a portion of a Church cuts itself loose from the constituted authorities of that Church, and sets up for itself, it abandons the old foundations, and must build its structure anew from the very bottom. It is logically impossible to repudiate and defy authority and at the same time act under it. The limb is dead the moment it is severed from the body. If there is no true ministerial authority except that which comes through an unbroken clerical succession, then Martin Luther ceased to be a gospel minister when Leo X. excommunicated him. For the same reason, when the English bishops, in the time of Henry VIII., renounced their allegiance to Rome, and thus forfeited all authority derived from Rome, they ceased to be valid ministers of the Church of God. If there exists nowhere the right to organize anew—if the pastoral office and the Church itself are absolutely traditional—then there is only one true church organization, and all who have separated themselves from her are schismatics. Thus the theory of the successionists leads logically to Rome, and we reject it as unscriptural and irrational.

But if we reject the extravagant claims of Rome, as well as the equally illogical and unscriptural notions of her feeble imitators, the question returns, What is the true nature of ordination?

Where matters are in a normal condition, ordination is the inauguration, the formal induction into office, of those whom the Church, in the exercise of her godly judgment, has called

to the work of the ministry. There is no occasion for speaking lightly of these formalities. There is scriptural precedent for them. There is historical precedent from the earliest ages of the Church. They are right and proper. They have significance and value. They were of special importance when the press did not exist to give publicity to church action, and to furnish a swift and reliable means of information to the general community. It is right, in our own day, that the minister elect should be solemnly reminded, in the presence of the Church, of the nature of the holy office to which he is called; that he should take upon him publicly the holy vows which bind him to perform his duty faithfully and in the fear of the Lord; and that he should be set forth before the people as one who, in the judgment of the Church, is divinely called to the work. Nevertheless, it is the election, and not the solemn forms of inauguration, which confers the office.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, in the 22d Article of Religion, affirms that "it is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word," and that "every particular Church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification." If the Church should so order, every deacon, elder, or bishop would be fully empowered to perform the duties of his office the very moment his election is announced, without any formal induction whatever.

It is curious to observe how the theories and the customs prevalent in civil affairs differ from what, in cases certainly somewhat analogous, have grown—partly, we suspect, from the craft and partly from the superstitions of men—to be the idea and the custom in certain sections of the Church. The old maxim that "the king never dies," is based on the principle that the throne is never vacant, the son becoming king without any ceremony whatever, the very moment his royal father breathes his last. The splendors and stately forms of coronation day may be proper and right, but they do not confer sovereignty. They merely proclaim the fact already existing. The constitution of the United States demands that the president, before he to the work of the ministry. There is no occasion for speaking lightly of these formalities. There is scriptural precedent for them. There is historical precedent from the earliest ages of the Church. They are right and proper. They have significance and value. They were of special importance when the press did not exist to give publicity to church action, and to furnish a swift and reliable means of information to the general community. It is right, in our own day, that the minister elect should be solemnly reminded, in the presence of the Church, of the nature of the holy office to which he is called; that he should take upon him publicly the holy vows which bind him to perform his duty faithfully and in the fear of the Lord; and that he should be set forth before the people as one who, in the judgment of the Church, is divinely called to the work. Nevertheless, it is the election, and not the solemn forms of inauguration, which confers the office.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, in the 22d Article of Religion, affirms that "it is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word," and that "every particular Church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification." If the Church should so order, every deacon, elder, or bishop would be fully empowered to perform the duties of his office the very moment his election is announced, without any formal induction whatever.

It is curious to observe how the theories and the customs prevalent in civil affairs differ from what, in some certainly somewhat analogous, have grown—partly, we suspect, from the truth and partly from the superstitions of men—to be the idea and the custom in certain sections of the Church. The old maxim that "the king never dies," is based on the principle that the throne is never vacant, the son becoming king without any ceremony whatever, the very moment his royal father breathes his last. The splendors and stately forms of coronation day may be proper and right, but they do not confer sovereignty. They merely proclaim the fact already existing. The constitution of the United States demands that the president, before he enters upon the duties of his office, shall take an oath to perform those duties faithfully, but it prescribes nothing further in the way of a formal inauguration. The oath, taken in private, before any Justice of the Peace, would satisfy the terms of the constitution. And if this requirement be duly complied with, the president elect becomes, on the fourth of March, president in fact, though no man should see him that day save the magistrate.

Sometimes, however, even in the Church, men have the courage to look beyond custom, and rely on first principles. The English Wesleyans, for many years after the death of Mr. Wesley, constituted elders by simple election. And as late as 1851, George Piercey, a Wesleyan local preacher, not waiting to be sent by any society, went to China, and on his own responsibility began the work of a missionary. The work of the Lord prospered in his hands. Souls were converted, and the nucleus of a native Church was formed. The Conference at home, hearing of his efficiency and success, adopted him and his mission, elected him an elder in the Wesleyan body, and commissioned him by letter, investing him thus with full power to perform all the duties of the sacred office. Their action was wholly right and valid. His election conferred the office; and the formal letter which informed him of the action had in his case was valid evidence of his authority.

This idea is not altogether new. In the year 1547 sundry questions were propounded to Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, among them this: "Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop or priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?" His deliberate answer was: "He that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest, needeth no consecration, by the Scripture; for election or appointing thereto is sufficient.". Dr. White, afterward bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in his volume entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Church Considered," argues strongly in favor of measures which would have been allowable and valid only on the principle that a man duly elected to the episcopacy is a true bishop, whether ordained or not.

At the close of the war of independence the clergy and the people of the American Episcopal Churches desired greatly to

form a complete ecclesiastical organization, but how they were to do it was by no means clear. They had no bishop, and, as matters then stood, there was no way in which they could obtain one from the mother Church. An act of Parliament prohibited the English bishops from ordaining any bishop, elder, or deacon, unless the candidate took an oath of allegiance to the king of England, both as a temporal sovereign and the head of the Church. This fatally embarrassed the case. In this dilemma, Dr. White proposed the election of a permanent president of the Episcopal Convention, who should ordain deacons and elders, and thus supply the Churches with ministers, "without waiting," as he expressed it, "for the succession." He did not forget, however, Paul's exhortation to "comfort the feeble-minded," and he therefore adds the suggestion, that, if at any future time the succession should be obtained, "any supposed imperfection of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper, be supplied without acknowledging their nullity by a conditional ordination, resembling that of conditional baptism in the liturgy." To lend additional strength to his project, he states that it was an expedient once proposed by Archbishop Tillottson, and Bishops Patrick, Stillingfleet, and others, and that it had been actually practiced in Ireland by Archbishop Bramhall.

Dr. White here proposes to do precisely what Mr. Wesley did in the case of Dr. Coke; that is, to constitute a true bishop, and yet, for prudential reasons, withhold from him the official title. Dr. White's "president," like Mr. Wesley's "superintendent," was to perform all the duties of the episcopal office. In regard to irregularity, as the successionists would regard it, it is difficult to say which bears the palm, Mr. Wesley, who, being himself only a presbyter, proceeded to ordain his bishop, or Dr. White, who proposed that his bishop should proceed to act without being ordained to his office. The fact is, both were right; yet both hesitated to follow their own logic to its inevitable conclusion. Wesley would have done well to call Dr. Coke a bishop, as he certainly became such when accepted by the Conference. Dr. White and his fellow presbyters had a scriptural right to elect a bishop, and ordain him with their own hands. They had historic precedent in the example of the ancient Church of Alexandria,

where, for more than two centuries, the same presbyters who elected the bishop ordained him to office. The power to confer office implies of necessity the power to induct into office.

Dr. White's project did not meet with favor; but, on the contrary, it was determined to apply to foreign Churches for ecclesiastical authority to establish an American Church. Sundry young men were sent to England to secure ordination, but the archbishop of Canterbury very properly decided that he had no authority to ordain any man who declined to take the oath of allegiance, and to acknowledge the king of England as the head of the Church. They then made inquiries in France whether any one there, Catholic or Protestant, could be found to perform the all-important ceremony, but failed in the search. The whole affair is a spectacle of pitiable human weakness. No English bishop could impart authority of any kind in an American organization which had been wholly severed from the English Church. There was no more fitness in the inauguration of an American bishop or presbyter by foreign hands than in the inauguration of an American president or governor by the same agency. The same authority which elects must induct into office.

How solemnly men sometimes cast anchor in a great truth, and then, with equal solemnity, cut their cables and go drifting down the tide. In May, 1784, the leading clergy and laymen of the Episcopal Churches met in Philadelphia, and with all formality laid down certain "fundamental principles," as the Convention termed them. Dr. White presided over the deliberations. It was resolved—

> 1. That the Episcopal Church of these States is, and ought to be, independent of all foreign authority, ecclesiastical or civil.
>
> 2. That it hath, and ought to have, in common with all other religious societies, full and exclusive power to regulate the concerns of its own communion.—*Wilson's Life of Bishop White*, p. 99.

Who would imagine, after the enunciation of solid truths like these, that Dr. White would be found on his way to England to ask an English bishop to give him authority to perform the duties of the episcopal office to which he had been elected by his brethren? The principles which determine the case are clear, and of easy application. The Church of England is

a State Church. The laws of the realm demand that every candidate for orders shall take a solemn oath of allegiance to the English sovereign. Consequently, when the American colonies became independent of the mother country, it was impossible for the Episcopal Churches in this country to remain a part of the Church of England. By a series of events, which the Episcopalians of the United States were certainly entitled to regard as providential, they had been totally and forever severed from the jurisdiction of the mother Church. Having no authority whatever in the American Church, English bishops could bestow none. Dr. White had been duly elected to his office, and therefore had the essential element of a valid title to it. The presbyters of the American Episcopal Churches ought to have recognized the rights which their independent position gave them, and to have ordained their bishop with their own hands. Thus the Churches would not have been compelled to wait, Bishop White would have escaped a useless voyage, and the British Parliament would not have been put to the trouble of framing a special law, permitting the omission of the oath of allegiance in this particular case.

It seems marvelous that the mere ceremony of induction into office should be so magnified out of all due proportion. Still, as we look back over the past, we find that three several agencies have been at work to produce this preposterous result. First, the tendency of the Church, especially in times of general ignorance and spiritual declension, to attach undue importance to mere externals; secondly, the ambition of men who have found that their innate love of power and place can be gratified in the Church as well as the State, and who set themselves on high by pretending that divine grace flows only in one channel, and that they are the sole custodians and dispensers thereof; thirdly, the unscrupulous policy of civil rulers, who have seized upon the Church and made it the instrument of their state-craft, violating its rights, stripping it of its spiritual power, and sacrificing to their own unworthy uses its honor and its saving value among men. When a king or emperor has laid hands on the Church with this intent, we might naturally expect that the ecclesiastics who weakly submit to be his tools would seek to cover their shame and maintain their place before the people by claiming to possess all a State Church. The laws of the realm demand that every candidate for orders shall take a solemn oath of allegiance to the English sovereign. Consequently, when the American colonies became independent of the mother country, it was impossible for the Episcopal Churches in this country to remain a part of the Church of England. By a series of events, which the Episcopalians of the United States were certainly entitled to regard as providential, they had been totally and forever severed from the jurisdiction of the mother Church. Having no authority whatever in the American Church, English bishops could bestow none. Dr. White had been duly elected to his office, and therefore had the essential element of a valid title to it. The presbyters of the American Episcopal Churches ought to have recognized the rights which their independent position gave them, and to have ordained their bishop with their own hands. Thus the Churches would not have been compelled to wait, Bishop White would have escaped a useless voyage, and the British Parliament would not have been put to the trouble of framing a special law, permitting the omission of the oath of allegiance in this particular case.

It seems marvelous that the mere ceremony of induction into office should be so magnified out of all due proportion. Still, as we look back over the past, we find that three several agencies have been at work to produce this preposterous result. First, the tendency of the Church, especially in times of general ignorance and spiritual declension, to attach undue importance to mere externals; secondly, the ambition of men who have found that their innate love of power and place can be gratified in the Church as well as the State, and who set themselves on high by pretending that divine grace flows only in one channel, and that they are the sole custodians and dispensers thereof; thirdly, the unscrupulous policy of civil rulers, who have seized upon the Church and made it the instrument of their state-craft, violating its rights, stripping it of its spiritual power, and sacrificing to their own necessities its honor and its saving value among men. When a king or emperor has laid hands on the Church with this intent, we might naturally expect that the ecclesiastics who meekly submit to be his tools would seek to cover their shame and maintain their place before the people by claiming to possess all manner of ghostly powers and privileges, and thus divert attention from what they have really lost by ostentatiously pretending to have what they never had.

Such, in a degree, is the present condition of the Church of England. When Henry VIII. began his reign, England was but a province of the ecclesiastical empire of Rome. When he declared himself and his people independent of the pope, a servile Parliament by law conferred upon Henry the title of "the only supreme head of the Church of England upon earth," and thus placed the Church at the feet of the State. There it remains to this day. The most important and vital of Church powers, the selection of the chief ministers, is in the hands of the State. This is a usurpation and an outrage. The bishops of the English Church lack the most essential outward element of a true episcopacy—a scriptural election to the office. Where Rome has full sway we reject her authority as without solid foundation; but thus much at all events can be said in her favor, the professed head of the Church is one of her clergy. The English Church is, in its government, popery with a lay pope, and at the present time a female pope at that. Whoever can find in the New Testament a basis for such a form of organization must possess sharp eyes. We do not say, that because of this usurpation of unscriptural power by the State, the Church has ceased to be a part of the true Church of God. We are certainly tempted to feel that those who plume themselves on a "succession" derived from such sources must be endowed with intellects which are easily satisfied, or a vanity which is easily inflated. The State wrongs and humiliates the Church when it forcibly seizes upon it and makes it the tool of a corrupt government or the prop of a weak one, or when it seeks to avail itself of the moral weight and strength of the Church to anchor itself amid the adverse currents and the driving storms which it fears. No wonder that certain writers make so much noise and pother about ordinations, as if the whole question is determined not by a valid election, but by the laying on of this or that pair of hands.

In comparing the Church of England with the Methodist Episcopal Church it is curious to observe how the weakness of the one and the strength of the other on this vital point comes manner of ghostly powers and privileges, and thus divert attention from what they have really lost by ostentatiously pretending to have what they never had.

Such, in a degree, is the present condition of the Church of England. When Henry VIII. began his reign, England was but a province of the ecclesiastical empire of Rome. When he declared himself and his people independent of the pope, a servile Parliament by law conferred upon Henry the title of "the only supreme head of the Church of England upon earth," and thus placed the Church at the feet of the State. There it remains to this day. The most important and vital of Church powers, the selection of the chief ministers, is in the hands of the State. This is a usurpation and an outrage. The bishops of the English Church lack the most essential outward element of a true episcopacy—a scriptural election to the office. Where Rome has fell away we reject her authority as without solid foundation; but thus much at all events can be said in her favor, the professed head of the Church is one of her clergy. The English Church is, in its government, popery with a lay pope, and at the present time a female pope at that. Whoever can find in the New Testament a basis for such a form of organization must possess sharp eyes. We do not say, that because of this usurpation of unscriptural power by the State, the Church has ceased to be a part of the true Church of God. We are certainly tempted to feel that those who plume themselves on a "succession" derived from such sources must be endowed with intellects which are easily satisfied, or a vanity which is easily inflated. The State wrongs and humiliates the Church when it forcibly seizes upon it and makes it the tool of a corrupt government or the prop of a weak one, or when it seeks to avail itself of the moral weight and strength of the Church to anchor itself amid the adverse currents and the driving storms which it fears. No wonder that certain writers make so much noise and pother about ordinations, as if the whole question is determined not by a valid election, but by the laying on of this or that pair of hands.

In comparing the Church of England with the Methodist Episcopal Church it is curious to observe how the weakness of the one and the strength of the other on this vital point come to the surface in unexpected places. Our law declares that a bishop is to be constituted by two things—election by the General Conference, and consecration by bishops or elders. In ordaining a bishop the one conducting the service is directed to say, "The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, *now committed unto thee by the authority of the Church, through* the imposition of our hands," etc. In the English ritual the archbishop, at a certain stage of the ceremonies, demands that the Queen's mandate for the consecration be produced and read. He then administers the oath acknowledging the Queen as the supreme earthly head of the Church, and after certain other preliminaries, lays his hands upon the head of the candidate, saying, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, *now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands*," etc. The two rituals show on the very surface that in the one case the bishop becomes such by the choice of the Church, and in the other his authority rests upon another foundation, to wit, the will of a female member of the Church. It may not be good sense nor good Scripture to pretend that a valid ordination is every thing, and a valid election nothing; but under certain circumstances it may be good strategy. And yet to say that there can be no true minister unless there is an unbroken succession of ordinations from the days of the apostles is as absurd as to say that there can be no true friendship in modern times unless there has been an unbroken line of hand-shakings from Damon and Pythias. No shadow of doubt rests upon the validity of the ordinations of the Methodist Episcopal Church. At all events, we can never for one moment admit the superior claims of those who were never elected to office in a scriptural, valid way, even if episcopal hands sufficient in number to thatch a cathedral have been laid upon their heads.

Another question, somewhat discussed among us of late, is: Who ought to be set apart by the imposition of hands? It is contended that we have in the Methodist Episcopal Church two orders and one office, while certain other Churches hold that there must be of necessity three orders, and that, if bishops and elders are the same in order, we are not consistent when we induct the bishop into office by a third laying on of hands, to the surface at unexpected places. Our law declares that a bishop is to be constituted by two things—election by the General Conference, and consecration by bishops or elders. In ordaining a bishop the one conducting the service is directed to say, "The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee *by the authority of the Church, through* the imposition of our hands," etc. In the English ritual the archbishop, at a certain stage of the ceremonies, demands that the Queen's mandate for the consecration be produced and read. He then administers the oath acknowledging the Queen as the supreme earthly head of the Church, and after certain other preliminaries, lays his hands upon the head of the candidate, saying, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee *by the imposition of our hands*," etc. The two rituals show on the very surface that in the one case the bishop becomes such by the choice of the Church, and in the other his authority rests upon another foundation, to wit, the will of a female member of the Church. It may not be good sense nor good Scripture to pretend that a valid ordination is every thing, and a valid election nothing; but under certain circumstances it may be good strategy. And yet to say that there can be no true minister unless there is an unbroken succession of ordinations from the days of the apostles is as absurd as to say that there can be no true friendship in modern times unless there has been an unbroken line of hand-shakings from Damon and Pythias. No shadow of doubt rests upon the validity of the ordinations of the Methodist Episcopal Church. At all events, we can never for one moment admit the superior claims of those who were never elected to office in a scriptural, valid way, even if episcopal hands sufficient in number to thatch a cathedral have been laid upon their heads.

Another question, somewhat discussed among us of late, is: Who ought to be set apart by the imposition of hands? It is contended that we have in the Methodist Episcopal Church two orders and one office, while certain other Churches hold that there must be of necessity three orders, and that, if bishops and elders are the same in order, we are not consistent when we induct the bishop into office by a third laying on of hands.

whether we term the rite a third ordination, or, following the example of the Protestant Episcopal and the Romish Churches, call it a consecration.

On entering upon this inquiry, the first thing to settle is the meaning of the terms which belong to the question. What is an order? What is an office?

The ritual makes no distinction between these terms. It speaks of "the office and work of a bishop," and in exactly the same words names "the office and work" of an elder. It also names "the office of a deacon." Thus it appears from the words used in the most significant and solemn part of the ordination service, that we have not one office only, but three, in our ministry.

But how many "orders" have we? In the practical working of our system we distribute the active ministry into a number of classes: 1. Local preachers; 2. Local deacons; 3. Local elders; 4. Unordained preachers on trial in the conference; 5. Itinerant deacons; 6. Itinerant elders; 7. Presiding elders; 8. Bishops; 9. Supernumerary deacons; 10. Supernumerary elders. These classes are all distinct, the duties and powers of each being defined in the Discipline of the Church. No man can enter any one class or pass from one to another except by the formal action of the proper authorities. On examining the duties, powers, and privileges thus assigned we find them divisible into two classes—the temporary and the permanent. The unordained local preacher is licensed for one year only, and on the expiration of that period his license must be renewed or he ceases to be a local preacher. The preacher on trial in the Conference is received for one year only, and at the end of the year new action is taken by the Conference. The presiding elder is appointed for only one year. In these cases duties are assigned for a limited period named in the law of the Church; but when we elect to the office of a deacon, an elder, or a bishop, we assign duties and confer powers which we never expect to recall. These three offices are separated from each other by narrow intervals. A deacon can perform every duty which ordinarily belongs to an elder except one, that is, he cannot conduct the service in the administration of the Lord's Supper, although he may assist the elder therein. The bishops preside in the Conferences, decide

questions of law, appoint the preachers, and perform the rites of ordination and consecration; but if from any cause an Annual Conference is compelled to hold its session without the presence of a bishop, an elder, appointed by the absent bishop or elected by the Conference, presides, decides law questions, and appoints the preachers. If, by death or otherwise, there is no bishop left in the Church, the General Conference may elect one, and the elders consecrate him. Thus an elder may, in certain cases, perform the highest functions of the episcopal office, and be for the time a true bishop.

By the law of our Church, and by the immemorial usage of the general Church, the question in regard to the holding of solemn inauguration ceremonies is determined by the duration of the tenure of office. A local preacher is licensed for a year only, and he enters upon his office without any formal induction. The presiding elder is appointed for a year, and begins his work without inauguration rites of any kind. The elder who is made a temporary bishop by the vote of an Annual conference, is invested with a short-lived authority, and he, too, enters upon the duties of his position at once without form or ceremony; but a deacon, on becoming such, is invested with certain powers which he holds for life. On his election to the office of an elder he loses nothing of the powers which pertained to him as deacon, but receives certain additional ones. Should he become a bishop he loses no power pertaining to the eldership, but adds others. Thus in all three cases duties are assigned and powers are bestowed which are not limited to any set period, not liable to be recalled, but are held by a life tenure; and it seems proper to mark with special solemnities the setting apart of men for sacred duties which are to be their life-work.

We hold firmly the conviction that, so far as Church action goes, a valid election is the vital element of a valid ministry, and that if the Church so ordered, the office of deacon could be done away, or elders and bishops, duly elected, could be empowered to enter upon their several duties without any formal induction into office. Nevertheless, the solemn services of ordination and consecration, if not obligatory, are beautiful, impressive, and appropriate, and their continued observance is desirable to the end of time; and if we have questions of law, appoint the preachers, and perform the rites of ordination and consecration; but if from any cause an Annual Conference is compelled to hold its session without the presence of a bishop, an elder, appointed by the absent bishop or elected by the Conference, presides, decides law questions, and appoints the preachers. If, by death or otherwise, there is no bishop left in the Church, the General Conference may elect one, and the elders consecrate him. Thus an elder may, in certain cases, perform the highest functions of the episcopal office, and be for the time a true bishop.

By the law of our Church, and by the immemorial usage of the general Church, the question in regard to the holding of solemn inauguration ceremonies is determined by the duration of the tenure of office. A local preacher is licensed for a year only, and he enters upon his office without any formal induction. The presiding elder is appointed for a year, and begins his work without inauguration rites of any kind. The elder who is made a temporary bishop by the vote of an Annual conference, is invested with a short-lived authority, and he, too, enters upon the duties of his position at once without form or ceremony; but a deacon, on becoming such, is invested with certain powers which he holds for life. On his election to the office of an elder he loses nothing of the powers which pertained to him as deacon, but receives certain additional ones. Should he become a bishop he loses no power pertaining to the eldership, but adds others. Thus in all three cases duties are assigned and powers are bestowed which are not limited to any set period, not liable to be recalled, but are held by a life tenure; and it seems proper to mark with special solemnities the setting apart of men for sacred duties which are to be their life-work.

We hold firmly the conviction that, so far as Church polity goes, a valid election is the vital element of a valid ministry, and that if the Church so ordered, the office of deacon could be done away, or elders and bishops, duly elected, could be empowered to enter upon their several duties without any formal induction into office. Nevertheless, the solemn services of ordination and consecration, if not obligatory, are beautiful, impressive, and appropriate, and their continued observance is desirable to the end of time; and if we have more than one ordination, it would seem that we ought to have three. In regard to the regular duties of their respective offices, the interval between the deacon and the elder is far less than that between the elder and the bishop. The functions of the deacon and the elder lie almost in the same plane, and casual observers detect no difference between them. The responsibilities of the bishop involve the interests of so many ministers, Churches, and people, and involve them so deeply, as to justify peculiar care in selecting the minister upon whom they are to be laid, and peculiar solemnities in investing him with his sacred office. In this inauguration ceremony it is accordant with Scripture and history that there be hands laid upon the head of the candidate; and to this service the usage of ages applies the term *ordination* or consecration, or the conferring of orders. Thus it appears that while we utterly repudiate all "High Church" notions, we have, by the law of the Church, three offices in our ministry, and by the laws of language we have also three orders, and that the law of the Church and the usage of ages regard the laying on of hands as a regular part of the inauguration service where spiritual office is held by the life tenure.

If this interchange of the words order and office be deemed confusing and undesirable, it may be avoided by our agreeing to state principles and define terms, thus: That God has established the ministry for the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the oversight of the Church; that those who are called to this work constitute the order of the ministry; that in the Methodist Episcopal Church the functions of this ministry are distributed into three offices, and that ordination is the solemn induction of the deacon, elder, or bishop elect into an office of the order to which God and the Church have called him.

Art. III.—THE BIRTHPLACE OF JESUS, AND CHRONOLOGY OF HIS INFANCY.

"Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord," are the words of angelic messengers as quoted by Luke, (ii, 11.) "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king," are the harmonious utterances of the first Gospel, (Matt. ii, 1.) "Jesus was born at Nazareth," is the contra-assertion of the confident Frenchman, Renan, in his so-called "Life of Jesus." If this assertion were admitted to be true, then the above declarations of the Gospels must be untrue as to an important fact. The whole of the narrative depending upon that fact must be untrue. Every connected statement, whether of history or of doctrine, must also be discredited. Not only must the Gospels be affected—the first and third in particular—but there is in that case an utter failure in the fulfillment of the prophecies of the Old Testament, which pointed to Bethlehem, "the city of David," as the birthplace of the one who was to be the Messiah. Whatever else might or might not be true of Jesus and of Christianity, all Messianic claims must be utterly unfounded. But the mere assertion of a writer whose "*floruit*" is more than eighteen centuries after the event, can hardly be allowed to be of as much weight, or as likely to be accurate, as the written history known to have been extant within the century when the occurrence took place. What to the perverted judgment of the Gallic philosopher may appear to be an "awkward *détour*," may to right reason and historic truth seem to be a very natural and legitimate process, resulting in the actual fact as recorded by the evangelists; namely, the birth of Jesus at the royal city of Bethlehem-Judah. The burden of proof of "awkwardness" and "*détour*," if such there be, might, perhaps, safely be laid upon him who so arrogantly has assumed them, with the positive assurance that the final verdict would be, "Not proven."

But it may be suggested, in passing, that when once a certain class of writers have "donned" the philosophic garb, they cease to consider it necessary to stoop to the common-sense idea of proving any thing they may be pleased to conceive, and prefer, especially in matters of this kind, to dogmatize rather than

to reason; abandoning, indeed, that field to their so-stigmatized more credulous opponents, whose humility leads them to a painstaking search for truth rather than to leap to conclusions which find all their support in suppressing or rejecting fact.

It is, besides, the province of our present purpose to attempt to establish the authenticity of the four Gospels; but we may take it to be a fact admitted and proceeded upon by the writers who have so liberally supplied the world with so-called "Lives of Jesus," that these Gospels contain the fullest and most authentic account of this man, of all history the most noted and the noblest. Now in proof of his having been born in Bethlehem, the city of David, we have the positive statements of two of the evangelists, and the absence of any positive declarations to the contrary in any part of his subsequent history, or in any authentic contemporary history whatever. True, it is said that he was "of Nazareth," "called a Nazarene," "arose out of Nazareth," "was of Galilee," etc., but in no place is it said that he was BORN at Nazareth, while these expressions are accounted for by the evangelists themselves. It is, indeed, attempted to be shown that John on two several occasions teaches differently. But the calling of Galilee his "own country" does not necessarily imply birthplace; otherwise "his own city" must likewise mean the city of his birth, a conclusion which would convict both Matthew and Luke of self-contradiction, for both of them call Nazareth "his own city," and yet both put his birth at Bethlehem. In the other passage, where the multitude of Christ's enemies contended about his character, some holding that "he was that prophet," others that "he was the Christ," others objecting that "Christ cometh of the seed of David and out of the town of Bethlehem," it is observable that John leaves the matter undetermined; that he does not say that he need not be a Bethlehemitish son of David, nor does he say that Christ could "come out of Galilee." When, too, the Pharisees afterward said to Nicodemus, "Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet," John does not say that the Pharisees were in error in this point, but just does what one who wrote at a time when the facts in relation to Christ's birth were so widely known and so universally believed would most naturally be expected to do, leaves their statement without note or comment, as a simple exhibition of the fact that this was the

utmost they could do to disprove his Messiahship, leaving the commonly-known facts to supply what was needed to show their utter failure to discredit him. Besides, if John had believed that Jesus was of Galilee, and not of Davidic Bethlehemite extraction, it would have been absolutely necessary to rebut their statement with proof that the alleged impossibility of a prophet, or at least of Christ, coming out of Galilee, was not true. Instead of doing that, he tacitly admits their statement to be true with respect to Messiah, and yet maintains that Jesus is that Messiah, the son of David. By this he in effect affirms his birth at Bethlehem.

It has, however, been attempted to cast doubt upon this identification of the birthplace of Jesus by asserting as fact that while both Luke and Matthew agree in fixing upon Bethlehem, it is supposed that their statements clash with regard to the connection, of the family of Joseph, and consequently of Jesus, with Nazareth, both prior to the nativity and afterward. It is said that Matthew seems to know nothing of Joseph having lived at Nazareth, and having come from that place to Bethlehem; that his representation is, that the settling at Nazareth was an after-thought, occasioned by his dread of Archelaus; and that he intimates that the matter was now overruled for the fulfillment of the prophecy, "He shall be called a Nazarene." On the other hand, it is said that Luke knew nothing of the visit of the Magi, the flight into Egypt, and the return to Nazareth.

Let us now take up each of their narratives, and arrange their facts the one wholly independently of the other.

In Matthew we have, first, the assertion to Joseph of the miraculous conception, the place being unnamed. Next we have the statement abruptly made that Jesus had been born (*γεννηθέντος*, aor. indef. past time) at some preceding time at "Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king." Then there is stated the fact that "wise men" (Magi) came from the East to *Jerusalem*, saying, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Then it is affirmed that Bethlehem was named as the place designated in prophecy, and that by Herod the Magi were instructed to go to Bethlehem; that they saw with gladness the re-appearance of the star which they had seen in their own country, and that they followed it until it stood over [*the house*] where the young child was, the particular place being no other-

wise distinguished. Then followed the offering of their gifts, their worship, their warning by dream, and their hasty departure to their own country by a way which avoided Jerusalem; then the dream-warning of Joseph and the immediate flight into Egypt, the death of Herod, the return therefrom, and their settlement in Nazareth.

Turning to Luke, we find that he gives an account of the annunciation and conception, giving (what Matthew omits) the name of the place where these things occurred as Nazareth. He states also how and why and when the journey to Bethlehem occurred, and the subsequent nativity there. Then he describes the angelic appearance to the shepherds, and the visit of these men to Bethlehem; his circumcision, also at Bethlehem; states that at the regular period, which by the law was determined to be at forty days after birth, Jesus was presented in the temple at Jerusalem, and that from the temple he was taken by his parents to "their own city of Nazareth."

If now we attempt to fix the time of the visit of the "wise men," adopting the common theory that it was made to Bethlehem, and are guided by Matthew's statements, we must necessarily fix it after the presentation in the temple;* for that presentation must have occurred prior to the flight into Egypt, since on their return from Egypt they went to Nazareth, carefully avoiding Judea. Moreover, the reason assigned by Matthew for avoiding Judea (namely, that they had heard that Archelaus reigned in Herod's stead, and they were therefore afraid to go there) renders it improbable, if not wholly incredible, that in the brief period of a fraction of forty days † they had so overcome their fears as to return from Nazareth to Jerusalem, especially while Herod's son, the object of their fear, was still ruling. It is therefore morally certain that whether they returned thither or not they had left Bethlehem and visited Jerusalem prior to the

---

* It may be suggested that the presentation in the temple must have occurred much more than forty days prior to Herod's death, which took place about April.

† A small fraction of forty days it must have been, for the visit of the Magi could not have been made prior to the circumcision, since the flight took place the day after their departure. If we count a week for the journey to Egypt, four or five days only of a sojourn there, and then another week for their return to the borders of Judea, and then count five days for the journey to Nazareth—a very brief period in which to accomplish so much—we have already consumed about thirty days from the birthday, leaving but ten days during which to overcome their fears, and make the journey to Jerusalem.

coming of the Magi. To say now that immediately after the presentation in the temple Joseph and his family returned to Bethlehem, is to bring ourselves into conflict with the direct and positive statement of Luke, that they at once returned to Nazareth from Jerusalem. It is to be observed that Luke, with the carefulness characteristic of a writer accustomed to historic composition, states distinctly the localities where the several incidents occurred, while Matthew seems to have but little regard to the mention of places, except where a prophecy is concerned, or some purpose otherwise not to be accomplished is to be subserved. Let us see, then, if there be not some method whereby Matthew and Luke may both be justified in their statement as to the birthplace of Jesus, while yet retaining as true both the former and latter residence at Nazareth.

We need not take the trouble to show that within the brief period of forty days there could not have taken place the circumcision on the eighth day, still at Bethlehem; the visit of the Magi and the flight to Egypt; the journey back from Egypt and the going to Nazareth; then a return to Jerusalem and the public presentation in the temple, since this is rendered altogether impossible—first, by the brevity of the time; and secondly, by the danger which, on this theory of the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem within the forty days, had already sent the family to Nazareth, and which within the remaining part of the forty days subsequent to their assumed arrival at Nazareth and hasty return to Jerusalem could not have passed away.

Our justification of the two narratives is possible, but possible, perhaps, only on the theory that the visit of the Magi was made not to Bethlehem but to Nazareth, and that Nazareth also was the point of departure in the flight into Egypt. A careful reading of Matthew will satisfy any truth-loving mind that he does not state that the child was at Bethlehem when the Magi came to Jerusalem. He states only that Jesus *had been born there.* Neither does he say that the Magi ever reached Bethlehem: only that they were *told by Herod to go there.* On the other hand, he states that the star which they had seen in their own country re-appeared to them; that they were filled with great joy at its re-appearance, and followed it as it went before them until it stood over the *house*—not *stable*—where the young child was. Now let it be remembered that

Bethlehem was only some six miles from Jerusalem; that the road was a plain, commonly traveled thoroughfare to a place well known; that that place was a small village in which there could be little difficulty in finding a strange family in which had occurred the birth of a child—and one can see no reason for the re-appearance of the star, and for their great joy when they saw it, nor for the marked and distinctive significance with which it is stated that "it went before them until it came and stood over the house where the young child was." Change the supposition, however, and think of them as starting with the *design* of going to Bethlehem; that upon their arrival outside the Jaffa or Bethlehem gate, about to turn their steps southward toward the well-known "city of David," they saw the star which went before them leading them in a direction the exact opposite, northward toward Nazareth—and we can at once account for the re-appearance of the star, and their great joy. For on this theory, the place where they were going and the way thereto were wholly unknown to them, and a guide was in consequence absolutely necessary. In coming from their own country to Jerusalem there is no intimation that they followed the star. During that journey, indeed, such a guide would have been wholly unnecessary while they were pursuing their way along the ordinary caravan route to a well-known city and a definite destination, a case the very opposite of that which, on our theory, now existed. We can also see the reasons for the particularity of the guidance given them by the star resting over the very house: for while it would have been easy (as before said) to find a family of *strangers* to which, while merely sojourning for the purpose of registration, a child had been born, it might have been much more difficult to find which one of the numerous families at Nazareth was the one intended. Guidance by the star, also, in this case, prevented the necessity of inquiry; and an inquiry of this kind would have led to as much excitement and talk at Nazareth, proportionately, as had been occasioned at Jerusalem. To the Divine mind, moreover, it was known to be essential that the visit should now be made with as little publicity as possible, in order to give time to escape from the pursuit and hostile designs of Herod.

If now we suppose, what is in every respect most probable, that Herod waited only until the closing of the day following their

departure from him, and then sent messengers to Bethlehem to inquire as to the reason of the delay of the Magi in returning, and that these messengers brought back the report that no such persons had been at Bethlehem, or had even been seen on the way to that place, we can see the force of the expression "when he saw that he was MOCKED of the wise men." We can readily conceive how this departure from the letter of their instructions, and his being thus for the present thwarted in his crafty purposes, should add to the fury of his indignation; and being wholly at a loss what route to pursue after them, and in lack of immediate information, it is in perfect keeping with the man that he should in his frenzy order the "murder of the innocents." On this interpretation it is easy to understand the otherwise incomprehensible facility with which the Magi escaped out of his jurisdiction, and how they could return to their own country without passing through or near Jerusalem, a matter, to say the least, of very difficult accomplishment from Bethlehem; for to any country east of Jerusalem the route from Bethlehem would have been by way of that city, or near to it, unless they had pursued the way far southward around the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, a route difficult, unfrequented, and still, for the most part, in a populous department of the kingdom of Herod. On that route they could readily have been traced by the myrmidons of the king, who in that event would have had to help in the search, their starting-point being the village of Bethlehem, with a knowledge of their final destination. But the circumstances were entirely different when there was only known to him their departure from Jerusalem, leaving him in utter ignorance as to where their subsequent steps were directed. To trace their course in this latter case would be encumbered with difficulties. It would in any event be a work of time and labor; of time sufficient to give opportunity for the Magi to reach a place of safety beyond the jurisdiction of Herod. On the other hand, to go to Jerusalem from Nazareth is far out of the route of the return of the Magi to any country from which they have ever been supposed to have come. Their homeward route lay across the Jordan, leaving Jerusalem far to the south and west, and every mile of their progress would lessen the chances of their falling into the hands of the exasperated king. When Joseph fled, his route, also, was across Jordan, down through Perea, east of the

Dead Sea; and long before any pursuit could have been made he would have been far enough on his way to have been wholly out of Herod's jurisdiction. That Herod would ultimately trace the Magi to Nazareth was doubtless true, and was the danger against which the warning was given, and on account of which the flight was directed. But the difficulties would be great and the progress slow in tracing the family in a departure suddenly and secretly made for an unknown destination. If it be asked why they fled to Egypt rather than to Syria or another country, the answer is that it was the nearest country in which their safety would be assured; the country in which Herod's influence was least felt, and whose rulers were most hostile to him and his race; for Syria was, in its governmental relations as a part of the Roman Empire, most nearly related to the dominions of Herod, which were afterward absorbed by it, and the region beyond Jordan was governed by rulers of the Herodian family. It may also be suggested, that while it was not with the direct and only purpose of fulfilling prophecy, but rather in accordance with the necessity and fitness of things that the direction was given, there nevertheless seems to have been in that direction a reference to the prophecy, and the typical fact of Israel's former residence in Egypt, and the prediction that of Messiah it should be said, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son."

When in Egypt Joseph was informed, in a dream, of the death of Herod, and directed to go "to the land of Israel," an expression which in its popular and distinctive meaning indicates Samaria and Galilee. Arising, he with his family came on his way toward the land of Israel. But having heard that Archelaus was exercising the kingly office over Judea, he was afraid to go there, (that is, to pass through Judea,) and was instructed in a dream "to turn aside to the parts of Galilee;" that is, he was instructed to take the route on the other side of the Dead Sea, east of the dominions of Archelaus. The country through which he was thus to pass was under the same tetrarchy or government as was Galilee—that of Herod Antipas—and was properly named "the parts (of the tetrarchy) of Galilee." By this route, which was beyond the reach of any interference from the cruel Archelaus, he could pursue his journey in security under the milder government of

the tetrarch of Galilee, his own country, until he again reached his own home at Nazareth. On this theory, the narratives of the two evangelists are capable of a complete reconciliation, and supplement each other, so that we have the fact of Christ's birth at Bethlehem clearly vindicated from the aspersions cast upon it by reason of seeming conflict, and it can be seen also why, notwithstanding this fact, he could yet be "called a Nazarene."

The precise date so distinctly enunciated by the evangelist as "this day" was doubtless well known to the writers of the Gospels. It is now matter of controversy. It is even disputed among writers as to what was the season of the year in which it took place. Until about the middle of the fourth century the Eastern Church had regarded the sixth of January as the day, but the Western Church had observed the twenty-fifth of December. That most eminent prelate of the Greek Church, Chrysostom, asserts that through the records of the taxing preserved at Rome, the twenty-fifth day of December had been long known as the proper day to the Christians of that city, and was from the close of the fourth century commemorated by both East and West as the birthday of Jesus.

Other sources of information seem to furnish confirmation of this traditionary view. Thus it has been found that the priestly course of Abia, of which Zacharias the father of John was a ministering priest, performed its functions during the months of October and April. This would give as the period of John's birth the month of June or December. Six months later would give for the birth of Jesus, in the former case December, in the latter June. Climatic conditions and the pastoral habits of the country must be allowed to give the preponderance to December. They render it almost certain that the traditionary time is nearly, if not altogether, accurate. "In the month of May vegetation in that country attains its greatest perfection, and then begins to decline rapidly for want of rain. In June, in the region round about Jerusalem, herbage becoming parched, the wandering Arabs begin to move northward with their flocks." In the consideration of this question the climatic observations have been too frequently taken in a more northern latitude than that of Bethlehem and Jerusalem, as at Aleppo and Damascus, in the region of Lebanon and "snowy Hermon."

Hence some have concluded that the month of December is too cold and wet to answer the conditions required by what is narrated of this event. But the average temperature of the month of December, during four years from 1851, was 54° 5′. The average for the entire winter season is from 50° to 53¼°, more than 20° above freezing-point. During this month the earth is fully clothed with rich verdure. Wheat, barley, and various kinds of pulse are still sown. In market are sugar-cane, cauliflowers, cabbages, radishes, lettuce, lentils, etc. Plowing still continues. The sowing of grain has already begun. Between the middle of December and the middle of February there is usually an interval of several weeks of dry weather. The period about Christmas is often one of the loveliest periods of the whole year, and is favorable for feeding the flocks in the open fields. At Bethlehem, which is six miles south of Jerusalem, and much less elevated, and especially in the neighboring valleys, the climate is still more mild. It is further to be noted that in the summer time the shepherds were accustomed to leave their homes and go from the neighborhood of the cities and villages, and, as the pastoral Arabs now do, drive their flocks far off into the wilderness, and there remain during the summer months. Upon the coming of winter they returned to their homes. It is perfectly in accordance with these facts and customs that in December the shepherds should be in the fields near the city, and in the thickly populated country in the region of Jerusalem. The fact that they were out during the night makes no difficulty, nor creates any improbability against December, even if we grant that they were unsheltered by huts or booths. In the summer, especially during the parching heats of June, they would have sought with their flocks the deep shades of the mountains or the wooded pasture lands of the wilderness.

We may now present a chronological synopsis of the evangelical history up to the period of the return from Egypt, to show how naturally and how fully the Gospel history harmonizes with facts known from other sources.

If we take a day in the latter part of December, say for definiteness, and to harmonize with tradition, the 25th day of December, in the year of Rome 749—the fifth before our common era or *anno Domini*—as the date of the birth of Jesus, the succeeding events arrange themselves thus:

During the first week must be placed the visit of the shepherds. The first of January, 750, (or before A. D. 4,) would witness the circumcision at Bethlehem; forty days after the birth, or February 3, would be the time for the purification in the temple at Jerusalem; during the next ten days, or by the 13th of February, they would easily reach their home in Nazareth. If now we suppose that the Magi reached Jerusalem five days after the departure of Joseph, and that the star had appeared to them simultaneously with the birth of Jesus, we have now a period of forty-five days, during which they might easily have traveled from any country which has ever been suggested as their home. Allow them to have remained one day at Jerusalem, and thence to have consumed five days in traveling the distance from Jerusalem to Nazareth, and we should find their visit to have occurred about February 14, an interval made memorable as well by the slaughter of the "innocents" as by their journey. Spending one day and night at Nazareth, the morning of the 16th would find the Magi on their return, and long before dawn of the next day, the 17th, Joseph himself would have hastily fled with all speed toward the fords of the Jordan and the land of Egypt. The death of Herod took place not later than the first week in April, so that Joseph had about six weeks for the journey to Egypt and residence there; and allowing that Joseph was immediately notified of Herod's death, and at once returned, he would again reach Nazareth about the first of May. Thus, then, we have the whole of these events, without jostling or crowding, and without departing at all from the most reasonable probabilities, comprised within the period during which they have usually been conceived to have occurred, and during which it would seem that they must have occurred. For, according to the very best authorities, the birth of Christ must have been about this period; certainly not earlier, nor could it have been much later, since Herod's death is the absolute limit for the close of this series of events, and this happened, as stated, in the beginning of April, A. U. C. 750, or *ante* A. D. 4.

It will be seen that in discussing this chronology no reference has been made to the "decree of Augustus—that all the world should be enrolled or taxed," and Luke's statement with reference to the governorship of Cyrenius, because for our purpose

such reference is useless. In the narration of Luke such mention was at least appropriate and pertinent, if not absolutely necessary. By this reference it was not so much the purpose and intention of Luke to fix a date (since that was fixed by other statements) as to state the *reason why* Joseph went to Bethlehem, and to prevent error in the reference to the occurrence; an error, indeed, to which his citing the "governorship of Cyrenius" might naturally lead if the citation were not qualified. His intention, in fact, was to prevent the time of Joseph's going up to Bethlehem from being confounded with the time when the enrollment was actually made by Cyrenius. He simply states, therefore, that a decree for the taxing (or enrollment) had been issued by Augustus, and that in compliance with that decree Joseph went to his own city. He then adds parenthetically, "This (that is, not the decree, for the difference in genders of the *αυτη* and *δογμα* forbids that, but the) enrollment or taxing, namely the first, was made when Cyrenius (Quirinius) was governor of Syria." Thus the inaccuracy alleged against Luke wholly disappears, since it is known from Josephus that nine years later, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, an actual enrollment and taxation, the first recorded, was made in Judea, the precise fact which Luke states. In other words, this enrollment or taxing, the first on record for Judea as a Roman province, was made in accordance with and by authority of that decree of Augustus by virtue of which Joseph had been compelled to go up to Bethlehem; but the enrollment was not actually made at the time of Joseph's visit, the decree not having been enforced until the period when Cyrenius came as governor of Syria. That the enrollment was not actually made during Joseph's sojourn at Bethlehem is plainly inferable from the fact, that if it had existed it would have been known to Herod, who by means of the registry could have secured the information necessary to find, and thus destroy, this last scion of the Davidic house. Reasons both for the issuing of the decree and the suspension of its execution may be found in the loss of favor, and subsequent, almost immediate, restoration to favor of Herod with Augustus, which are known to have taken place about this time.

By this interpretation—an interpretation in perfect consonance with the facts of history as elsewhere set forth—all that is apparent such reference is useless. In the intention of Luke such mention was at least appropriate and pertinent, if not absolutely necessary. By this reference it was not so much the purpose and intention of Luke to fix a date (since that was fixed by other statements) as to state the reason why Joseph went to Bethlehem, and to prevent error in the reference to the enrolment; an error, indeed, to which his citing the "governorship of Cyrenius" might naturally lead if the citation were not qualified. His intention, in fact, was to prevent the time of Joseph's going up to Bethlehem from being confounded with the time when the enrollment was actually made by Cyrenius. He simply states, therefore, that a decree for the taxing (or enrollment) had been issued by Augustus, and that in compliance with that decree Joseph went to his own city. He then adds parenthetically, "This (that is, not the decree, for the difference in genders of the *αὕτη* and *δόγμα* forbids that, but the) enrollment or taxing, namely, the first, was made when Cyrenius (Quirinius) was governor of Syria." Thus the inaccuracy alleged against Luke wholly disappears, since it is known from Josephus that nine years later, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, an actual enrollment and taxation, the first recorded, was made in Judea, the precise fact which Luke states. In other words, this enrollment or taxing, the first on record for Judea as a Roman province, was made in accordance with and by authority of that decree of Augustus by virtue of which Joseph had been compelled to go up to Bethlehem; but the enrollment was not actually made at the time of Joseph's visit, the decree not having been enforced until the period when Cyrenius came as governor of Syria. That the enrollment was not actually made during Joseph's sojourn at Bethlehem is plainly inferable from the fact, that if it had existed it would have been known to Herod, who by means of the registry could have secured the information necessary to find, and thus destroy, this last scion of the Davidic house. Reasons both for the issuing of the decree and the suspension of its execution may be found in the loss of favor, and subsequent, almost immediate, restoration to favor of Herod with Augustus, which are known to have taken place about this time.

By this interpretation—an interpretation in perfect consonance with the facts of history as elsewhere set forth—all that is apparent on the face of the narrative as Luke's purpose is seen to be fully and with precision accomplished. For the vindication of the evangelist in his particular statement it is not necessary to prove, as Zumpt endeavors to do,* that Cyrenius was governor at this

---

* I say "endeavors to do," for Zumpt "does not," as Alford remarks, "quite remove our difficulty." It may be suggested, as worthy of consideration, whether Cyrenius, however, might not have been in Judea at the time of Joseph's visit to Bethlehem, not as successor of Saturninus or Varus, but of Volumnius, the copartner of Saturninus, and whether his term of office did not begin before that of Saturninus ended, and continue after Varus came, thus covering the closing part of the term of Saturninus and the opening, or early part, of that of Varus—filling whatever length of time there was between the departure of Volumnius and the coming of Sabinus—thus in a secondary position, and yet, perhaps, with greater activity than his superior, being employed in Judaic affairs. It may be noted that Volumnius does not seem to have remained in Syria as long as Saturninus, and that no one is named by Josephus for the interval between Volumnius and Sabinus—the very period during which the birth of Jesus took place. May not, then, this interval have been filled by Cyrenius, as immediate successor of Volumnius? May it not further be suggested as most probable, that the birth of Jesus occurred after, indeed, Varus had been appointed governor, but while Saturninus was still acting—Varus not having yet reached the head-quarters of the Government, but was journeying through the province toward it, passing through Jerusalem, where he was in intercourse with Herod for a time? Might not this explain Patritius's assertion that Saturninus was governor, and Cyrenius legate, extraordinary, and justify, 1. The statement of Justin Martyr that Cyrenius was governor at our Lord's birth? 2. That of Tertullian, that Saturninus held that position; and, 3. The teaching of Josephus, who assigns this period to Varus—he holding it *de jure*, but Saturninus meanwhile holding over, and thus being governor *de facto*? It may also serve a purpose to inquire what may be the precise relation to this matter of the fact deducible from Josephus, that one named Joazer, the son of Boethus, was high priest at or near the time of Christ's birth, and also at the period when Cyrenius was making the taxing. May not that astute (?) historian have fallen into confusion as to time, or be guilty of a suppression of facts, and yet there be found enough in his narrative to afford an unwitting but somewhat obscure confirmation of Luke's statement, and of a first and second governorship—the first rather as subordinate, the second as chief, governor? For, writing of Cyrenius's coming "to take account of their (the Jews) substance, and to dispose of Archelaus's money," he adds: "But the Jews, although at the beginning they took the report of a taxation heinously, yet did they leave off any further opposition to it by the persuasion of Joazer, who was the son of Boethus, and high priest; so they, being over-persuaded by Joazer's words, gave an account of their estates without any dispute about it." *Ant.*, book xviii, c. i, § 1. Joazer was made high priest by Herod near the close of his life, and was deposed by Archelaus just after his accession to the throne. *Ibid.*, book xvii, c. xiii, § 1. Ten years later Cyrenius also deposed him, on account of some contention with the multitude. *Ibid.*, book xviii, c. ii, § 1. It is probable, therefore, that the "beginning" named by Josephus refers to Joazer's first high priesthood, and that nine years later a second installation into that office was given him by Cyrenius, as a grateful memento of his former services, and with the hope of

very period of the issuing of the decree, whether as the successor or co-partner of Varus. The fact may be, and possibly is, somewhat as he points out; but if further investigations prove his conclusions erroneous, the statement of Luke will not thereby be contradicted or rendered truthless.

It remains simply to be said in conclusion, that the *détour* if such it be, by which the evangelists make the birth of Jesus to have taken place at Bethlehem, and *not* at Nazareth, is perfectly accounted for, and in precise agreement with all that is taught in the Gospels; that it is an essential part, as authentic and proper for credence as any other part thereof; that it is not to be dismissed by a contemptuous unphilosophic-philosophic dilletanti's *dictum*, and that it may not be ignored with an irrational and reasonless sneer. It stands unshaken, and must to stand as irrefragible truth, or the foundations of our Christian system will be endangered or destroyed. But "the gates of hell prevail against it" never!!

Art. IV.—PROPOSED NEW ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

Respectfully Submitted for Consideration to the General Conference of 1872.

Argument.

That our Articles of Religion, as they now stand, contain a summary of our *distinctive* doctrines, or those by which we, as a Church, are distinguished from other denominations, will hardly be affirmed.

They were, as is well known, (except the Twenty-third,) abridged from those of the Church of England, which were a summary of doctrines adopted by Protestants dissenting from

---

similar advantages to himself in the favor of the people. A result different from what he had expected made it expedient to remove him. And now may it not be further suggested, that since at no other time than about A. U. C. 749—the closing year of Herod's reign—there could have occurred such a conjuncture of circumstances as have been presented, explaining or removing the difficulties hitherto remaining, strong confirmation is thereby afforded to that hypothesis which assumes our Lord's birth to have taken place in the closing months of A. U. C. 749, *ante* A. D. 5?

very period of the issuing of the decree, whether as the successor or co-partner of Varus. The fact may be, and possibly is, somewhat as he points out; but if further investigations prove his conclusions erroneous, the statement of Luke will not thereby be contradicted or rendered truthless.

It remains simply to be said in conclusion, that the *decree*, if such it be, by which the evangelist makes the birth of Jesus to have taken place at Bethlehem, and not at Nazareth, is perfectly accounted for, and in precise agreement with all that is taught in the Gospels; that it is an essential part, as authentic and proper for credence as any other part thereof; that it is not to be dismissed by a contemptuous unphilosophic philosophic dilettante's *dictum*, and that it may not be ignored with an irrational and reasonless sneer. It stands unshaken, and must ye stand as irrefragible truth, or the foundations of our Christian system will be endangered or destroyed. But "the gates of hell prevail against it" never!!

Art. IV.—PROPOSED NEW ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

Respectfully Submitted for Consideration to the General Conference of 1876.

ARGUMENT.

That our Articles of Religion, as they now stand, contain a summary of our distinctive doctrines, or those by which we, as a Church, are distinguished from other denominations, will hardly be affirmed.

They were, as is well known, (except the Twenty-third,) abridged from those of the Church of England, which were a summary of doctrines adopted by Protestants dissenting from

---

similar advantages to himself in the favor of the people. A result different from what he had expected made it expedient to remove him. And now may it not be safely affirmed, that since at no other time than about A. U. C. 750—the closing year of Herod's reign—there could have occurred such a conjunction of circumstances as has been here presented, explaining or rendering the otherwise intricate consistent, a strong confirmation is thereby afforded to that hypothesis which assumes our Lord's birth to have taken place in the closing months of A. U. C. 749, and B. C. 5?

the Church of Rome, and we know of no Protestant Church that does not cordially accept them, as far as they go.

But other Churches, while they agree with our Articles, have also Articles by which they are distinguished from us in matters of faith; and why should not *our* distinctive doctrines be also appropriately set forth? Our hymns contain more of our distinctive doctrines than do our Articles of Religion.

The primitive Church held councils and adopted new articles of faith and rules of moral discipline to meet the exigences of the times, in opposition to rising or established heresies; and as new heresies arose, new articles of faith were adopted in opposition to them. Thus "the apostles and elders" settled the question of circumcision, Acts xv. Luther's Reformation led to the Augsburg Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the Westminster and various other Confessions of Faith—each adhering to its distinctive views of theology—till every branch of the Christian Church (except ours) has its distinctive creed. Why should we remain thus singular?

About the year 1820 the Presbyterians on the Western Reserve, in Ohio, formed a Confession of Faith so abridged from their larger one as to omit their Calvinistic views. This they read to candidates on their admission to their Church. One article of this abridgment read thus: "Do you believe the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, as set forth in her Confession of Faith?" The candidate, supposing the Confession referred to was the one just read, of course answered in the affirmative. Not one in a hundred of them had ever seen the other; but when it was shown them they repudiated it, and many declared they had been deceived and misled, and not a few left that Church on that account. This circumstance led to deep and serious thought on the necessity and propriety of having our distinctive doctrines properly set forth in our Discipline, or Articles of Religion, lest the charge of duplicity or deception be also laid at our door.

It is true that our early Disciplines contained our "doctrinal tracts." That, of course, answered the purpose at that time. But those tracts have since been left out, and though printed in a separate volume are seldom found in company with the Discipline, and had not our preachers constantly declared our dis-the Church of Rome, and we know of no Protestant Church that does not cordially accept them, so far as they go.

But other Churches, while they agree with our Articles, have also Articles by which they are distinguished from us in matters of faith; and why should not our distinctive doctrines be also appropriately set forth? Our hymns contain more of our distinctive doctrines than do our Articles of Religion.

The primitive Church held councils and adopted new articles of faith and rules of moral discipline to meet the exigencies of the times, in opposition to rising or established heresies; and as new heresies arose, new articles of faith were adopted in opposition to them. Thus "the apostles and elders" settled the question of circumcision, Acts xv. Luther's Reformation led to the Augsburg Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the Westminster and various other Confessions of Faith—each adhering to its distinctive views of theology—till every branch of the Christian Church (except ours) has its distinctive creed. Why should we remain thus singular?

About the year 1820 the Presbyterians on the Western Reserve, in Ohio, formed a Confession of Faith so abridged from their larger one as to omit their Calvinistic views. This they read to candidates on their admission to their Church. One article of this abridgment read thus: "Do you believe the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, as set forth in her Confession of Faith?" The candidate, supposing the Confession referred to was the one just read, of course answered in the affirmative. Not one in a hundred of them had ever seen the other; but when it was shown them they repudiated it, and many declared they had been deceived and misled, and not a few left that Church on that account. This circumstance led to deep and serious thought on the necessity and propriety of having our distinctive doctrines properly set forth in our Discipline or Articles of Religion, lest the charge of duplicity or deception be also laid at our door.

It is true that our early Disciplines contained our "doctrinal tracts." That, of course, answered the purpose at that time. But those tracts have since been left out, and though printed in a separate volume are seldom found in company with the Discipline, and had not our preachers constantly declared our distinctive doctrines, and controverted their opposites, our people and the world would have been ignorant of them as a general thing.

But times have changed. Doctrinal sermons are not *now* the order of the day. If now a stranger were to examine our Articles of Religion to ascertain wherein we differ from other Churches, he could not find it there. If he attended our ministry he would be but little wiser on the subject, for other people preach now as "the Methodists do"—no other doctrines being popular—and unless pointed to the proper books he would not be likely to gain the information sought for. Any intelligent mind would naturally look to the Articles of Religion, or Confession of Faith, to ascertain the creed of any Church. Hence the necessity and propriety of the measure herein proposed.

Being long convinced upon this subject, and having waited half a century in hopes that some wiser head and abler pen would do the Church this service, but not seeing it done, at our General Conference in 1868 I ventured to present the subject, and the most of these new Articles, with the argument for their adoption, which were printed in the "Daily," but at too late a date to be acted upon.

A president of one of our colleges passed me in the conference-room with the paper in his hand, saying in reference to the new articles, "I think I shall join your Church," indicating his assent to the proposition. A prominent official editor said to me, "I agree with you in the necessity and propriety of this measure, but we have not time now, at this late day, to discuss the matter. I had no idea that so much could be expressed in so few words. I think possibly I am a little more Calvinistic than you are, but I will examine the matter." Perhaps a dozen or twenty prominent men present spoke favorably of the proposition, but said, "We have not time now to discuss the matter." Only one, and he not a *savan*, indicated *to me* any dissent, and he seemed to do so only from a fear of *any* amendment, lest the old landmarks should be removed.

The doctrines of "the witness of the Spirit" to the justification, adoption, or sanctification of the believer; of perfect love to God and man; of the possibility and danger of the final

apostasy of believers; of the free agency of man, in opposition to predestination, fore-ordination, or eternal decrees; of the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent; that repentance precedes conversion—with others which we believe and teach, are doctrines by which we are distinguished from some, if not most, other Churches; and yet not one of these are distinctively set forth in our Articles of Religion, though all are taught in our standard works.

If a minister of our Church should be charged with "holding and disseminating, publicly or privately, doctrines which are *contrary* to our Articles of Religion," and it should appear on the trial that he had denied or opposed one or more of these distinctive points, how could he be convicted, since none of them are in those Articles? What Article would he oppose, even if he preached Mormonism, including polygamy?

An important reason for the measure herein proposed is, the fact of the growth and extent of our Church even to other continents and hemispheres. If, as some think must be the case, our foreign missions should become independent Churches, it would certainly be desirable that they should have our doctrines and moral discipline in full, whereby a *fraternal* union, at least, may be continued. But if, as others hope and pray, the unity of the Church shall be preserved, like the apostolic, irrespective of national limits—if we adhere to the great commission, and "go into *all* the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" —our theological system should be applicable to the field we occupy to preserve our unity.

We believe and teach that Methodism, under God, is to, and will, be greatly instrumental in introducing the millennium, and surely the signs of the times indicate as much; then our theological system should be broad enough and deep enough to cover the ground we occupy.

Another very important reason for this measure is, the fact that already conflicting opinions exist among us on some minor points, and these divergences are growing wider and more numerous as time rolls on. To preserve our unity of faith, then, and hand it down to posterity unimpaired, is of paramount importance. It is also very appropriate that this measure should be adopted at the first General Conference in which our laymen have a voice.

apostasy of believers; of the free agency of man, in opposition to predestination, foreordination, or eternal decrees; of the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent; that repentance precedes conversion—with others which we believe and teach, are doctrines by which we are distinguished from some, if not most, other Churches; and yet not one of these are distinctively set forth in our Articles of Religion, though all are taught in our standard works.

If a minister of our Church should be charged with "holding and disseminating, publicly or privately, doctrines which are contrary to our Articles of Religion," and it should appear on the trial that he had denied or opposed one or more of these distinctive points, how could he be convicted, since none of them are in those Articles? What Article would he oppose, even if he preached Mormonism, including polygamy?

An important reason for the measure herein proposed is, the fact of the growth and extent of our Church even to other continents and hemispheres. If, as some think must be the case, our foreign missions should become independent Churches, it would certainly be desirable that they should have our doctrines and moral discipline in full, whereby a *Protestant* union, at least, may be continued. But if, as others hope and pray, the unity of the Church shall be preserved, like the apostolic, irrespective of national limits—if we adhere to the great commission, and "go into *all* the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" —our theological system should be applicable to the field we occupy to preserve our unity.

We believe and teach that Methodism, under God, is to, and will, be greatly instrumental in introducing the millennium, and surely the signs of the times indicate as much; then our theological system should be broad enough and deep enough to cover the ground we occupy.

Another very important reason for this measure is, the fact that already conflicting opinions exist among us on some minor points, and these divergences are growing wider and more numerous as time rolls on. To preserve our unity of faith, then, and hand it down to posterity unimpaired, is of paramount importance. It is also very appropriate that this measure should be adopted at the first General Conference in which our laymen have a voice.

It *may* be objected that our first Restrictive Rule prohibits this measure. But not so. That rule says, "The General Conference shall not *revoke, alter, or change* our Articles of Religion, nor establish any *new* standards or rules of doctrine *contrary* to our present existing and established standards of doctrine." But these proposed new Articles neither "revoke, alter, nor change" our present Articles; and though they are *new* as Articles, they are not "*contrary* to our (then or now) existing and established standards of doctrine," but in perfect harmony therewith.

The standards *then* known to the Church (in 1808) were the Bible, with the writings of Wesley and Fletcher—and possibly Coke—as its exponents. No other writings were *then* recognized as standards by our fathers, and the doctrines herein proposed are clearly contained in them, and, of course, are not contrary to them.

The language of the Restrictive Rule clearly indicates that the framers of it expected the adoption of *new* articles of religion in the course of time, or they would not have thus guarded the subject, confining the General Conference to the *then* acknowledged standards. If they had intended to prohibit new articles entirely they would have said so, and not have allowed them if they should agree with our standards.

The *note* appended to the Twenty-third Article, relative to civil government, is, to all intents and purposes, a *new* Article, and might and would have looked better, and read better, if it had been incorporated in the original, as it did not "revoke, alter, or change it," nor is it "contrary to our standards;" and if the General Conference could amend or add to that Article, it can do the same thing in this case.

It was a change in the circumstances of the Church that led to the adoption of that note. The Church had extended into Canada, and was holding a prominent position there, and that article of our creed recognizing the government of the United States gave rise to fears in the government of that province that *political* influences would grow out of it unfavorable to their interests, to prevent which, our ministers were curtailed in the rights and prerogatives of their offices—such as marrying their own people—and to relieve those fears this note was appended to our Twenty-third Article. But it availed nothing. While

It may be objected that our first Restrictive Rule prohibits this measure. But not so. That rule says, "The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, or change our Articles of Religion, nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine." But these proposed new Articles neither "revoke, alter, nor change" our present Articles; and though they are *new* as Articles, they are not "contrary to our (then or now) existing and established standards of doctrine," but in perfect harmony therewith.

The standards *then* known to the Church (in 1808) were the Bible, with the writings of Wesley and Fletcher—and possibly Coke—as its exponents. No other writings were *then* recognized as standards by our fathers, and the doctrines herein proposed are clearly contained in them, and, of course, are not contrary to them.

The language of the Restrictive Rule clearly indicates that the framers of it expected the adoption of new articles of religion in the course of time, or they would not have thus guarded the subject, confining the General Conference to the *then* acknowledged standards. If they had intended to prohibit new articles entirely they would have said so, and not have allowed them if they should agree with our standards.

The note appended to the Twenty-third Article, relative to civil government, is, to all intents and purposes, a new Article, and might and would have looked better, and read better, if it had been incorporated in the original, as it did not "revoke, alter, or change it," nor is it "contrary to our standards;" and if the General Conference could amend or add to that Article, it can do the same thing in this case.

It was a change in the circumstances of the Church that led to the adoption of that note. The Church had extended into Canada, and was holding a prominent position there, and that article of our creed recognizing the government of the United States gave rise to fears in the government of that province that political influences would grow out of it unfavorable to their interests, to prevent which, our ministers were curtailed in the rights and prerogatives of their office—such as marrying their own people—and to relieve those fears this note was appended to our Twenty-third Article. But it availed nothing. While the Article itself remained, and in the hands of men from the States, those fears continued. The truth is, though the Bible—our only legitimate authority on which to base an article of religion—recognizes civil government as a divine institution, and requires submission to "the powers that be," yet it does not prescribe the *form* of that government. Had the Article recognized the institution, and in terms as applicable to one form of it as to another, it is not probable the difficulty would have occurred. Our people within either the English or any other government could be patriotic and loyal without becoming the subjects of jealousy or oppression; and if it were possible, it would be better now to strike out that Article and adopt one more in accordance with the Bible, and in such general terms that people of all nations could adopt it without provoking jealousy and opposition.

Another change of this kind and nature has come over us. We have extended our jurisdiction to other continents and hemispheres, and fears have been expressed (at home) that our Twenty-third Article will cause similar trouble in other countries. At the time of the adoption of that Article (1784) our Church was entirely within the United States. The independence of these States had just been attained, and as our fathers *then* had little, if any, idea of ever extending the Church beyond the limits of the States, it seemed proper for them to express their patriotism and loyalty. But the changes of nearly a century have shown, that it would have been better to have manifested their patriotism and loyalty in some other way.

We have high authority for amending constitutions in the history of the United States' Constitution. It now has its fifteenth amendment; the necessity for the last three of them grew out of the late Rebellion within eleven years past. If any should object to this proposition on account of the *number* of articles it will give us, I would respectfully refer them to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, in which are thirty-three chapters, containing one hundred and seventy-one different articles. Several other Churches have about the same. Every new Article herein proposed stands opposed to some prominent error or heresy of to-day, and, when connected with the old ones, it is believed will cover the whole ground necessary in a confession of the kind.

the Article itself remained, and in the hearts of men from the States, those fears continued. The truth is, though the Bible—our only legitimate authority on which to base an article of religion—recognizes civil government as a divine institution, and requires submission to "the powers that be," yet it does not prescribe the *form* of that government. Had the Article recognized the institution, and in terms easy-flexible to one form, of it as to another, it is not probable the difficulty would have occurred. Our people within either the English or any other government could be patriotic and loyal without becoming the subjects of jealousy or opposition; and if it were possible, it would be better now to strike out that Article and adopt one more in accordance with the Bible, and in such general terms that people of all nations could adopt it without provoking jealousy and opposition.

Another change of this kind and nature has come over us. We have extended our jurisdiction to other continents and hemispheres, and fears have been expressed (at home) that our Twenty-third Article will cause similar trouble in other countries. At the time of the adoption of that Article (1785) our Church was entirely within the United States. The independence of these States had just been attained, and as our fathers then had little, if any, idea of ever extending the Church beyond the limits of the States, it seemed proper for them to express their patriotism and loyalty. But the changes of nearly a century have shown, that it would have been better to have manifested their patriotism and loyalty in some other way.

We have high authority for amending constitutions in the history of the United States' Constitution. It now has its fifteenth amendment; the necessity for the last three of them grew out of the late Rebellion within eleven years past. If any should object to this proposition on account of the number of articles it will give us, I would respectfully refer them to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, in which are thirty-three chapters, containing one hundred and seventy-one different articles. Several other Churches have about the same. Every new Article herein proposed stands opposed to some prominent error or heresy of to-day, and, when connected with the old ones, it is believed will cover the whole ground necessary in a confession of the kind.

In arranging the Articles, the new with the old, as they seem to be related to each other, the new ones are inclosed in brackets, [—], so that they can be distinguished, and, at the same time, the connection be seen. If any think they can improve the style or form of the new Articles, or have new ones to propose, or can improve the arrangement of them with the old, the subject is open to discussion and amendment, and is presented in this form for that purpose. But it is hoped none will be captious, or seek to amend for the sake of amending. I have no ambition for the authorship; but, having felt and seen the necessity and importance of the measure for half a century, I confess to a strong desire to have the work accomplished, believing it would be for the glory of God and the honor and benefit of the Church. If the proposition be adopted the section will be in the following form:

SECTION II.—ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

I. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.*

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, [who is a spirit, not matter,] of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. *Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very man.*

The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men.

III. [*Of the Sufferings of Christ.*

Although the Godhead and manhood were inseparably joined in the person of Christ, yet he suffered only in the flesh while he atoned in the divinity, the divinity being the altar. He sanctified the humanity as the gift.]

In arranging the Articles, the new with the old, as they seem to be related to each other, the new ones are inclosed in brackets, [—], so that they can be distinguished, and, at the same time, the connection be seen. If any think they can improve the style or form of the new Articles, or have new ones to propose, or can improve the arrangement of them with the old, the subject is open to discussion and amendment, and is presented in this form for that purpose. But it is hoped none will be captious, or seek to amend for the sake of amending. I have no ambition for the authorship; but, having felt and seen the necessity and importance of the measure for half a century, I confess to a strong desire to have the work accomplished, believing it would be for the glory of God and the honor and benefit of the Church. If the proposition be adopted the section will be in the following form:

SECTION II.—ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

I. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.*

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, [who is a spirit, not matter,] of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. *Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very man.*

The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men.

III. [*Of the Sufferings of Christ.*

Although the Godhead and manhood were inseparably joined in the person of Christ, yet he suffered only in the flesh while he atoned in the divinity, the divinity being the altar. He sanctified the humanity as the gift.]

IV. *Of the Resurrection of Christ.*

Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

V. [*Of the Immortality of the Soul.*

The soul of man, being spirit, is immortal, and will be in a conscious state between death and the resurrection, as in the case of the rich man and Lazarus.]

VI. [*Of the General Resurrection.*

The resurrection of Christ conquered and subdued death, and secured the resurrection of all men ; the good to the resurrection of life, the bad to damnation.]

VII. [*Of the General Judgment.*

God has appointed a day, which is unknown to man, wherein he will judge the world by the Man whom he hath ordained, (Christ,) and before whom the dead, small and great, shall stand; the issues of which, both in rewards and punishments, will be eternal, being the result of an eternal judgment. This final judgment, and the end of the world, cannot occur until the Gospel has had universal sway, the heathen have been given to Christ, the kingdoms of the world have become the kingdoms of God and his Christ, and he, as King of kings and Lord of lords, shall have reigned in spirit a thousand years on the earth. Wherefore such as look for the end of the world before these events (they being of prophecy) have taken place are in error, without authority of God's word, and not to be believed.]

VIII. *Of the Holy Ghost.*

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

IX. [*Of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, or Unpardonable Sin.*

This sin consists in attributing the miracles of Christ to the devil; in willfully resisting and blaspheming against the Holy

IV. *Of the Resurrection of Christ.*

Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

V. [*Of the Immortality of the Soul.*

The soul of man, being spirit, is immortal, and will be in a conscious state between death and the resurrection, as in the case of the rich man and Lazarus.]

VI. [*Of the General Resurrection.*

The resurrection of Christ conquered and abolished death, and secured the resurrection of all men; the good to the resurrection of life, the bad to damnation.]

VII. [*Of the General Judgment.*

God has appointed a day, which is unknown to men, wherein he will judge the world by the Man whom he hath ordained, (Christ,) and before whom the dead, small and great, shall stand; the issues of which, both in rewards and punishments, will be eternal, being the results of an eternal judgment. This final judgment, and the end of the world, cannot occur until the Gospel has had universal sway, the heathen have been given to Christ, the kingdoms of the world have become the kingdoms of God and his Christ, and he, as King of kings and Lord of lords, shall have reigned in spirit a thousand years on the earth. Wherefore such as look for the end of the world before these events (they being of prophecy) have taken place are in error, without authority of God's word, and not to be believed.]

VIII. *Of the Holy Ghost.*

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

IX. [*Of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, or Unpardonable Sin.*

This sin consists in attributing the miracles of Christ to the devil; in willfully resisting and blaspheming against the Holy

Ghost till he will strive with the sinner no more; in willfully falling away from Christ after being wholly sanctified, tasting the good word of God, and the power of the world to come; counting the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing: either being a sin unto death, for which we are not to pray. A sinner in this state is lost to all good or desire for good; hence, no one is forsaken of God, and beyond the reach of mercy, while the Spirit is striving with him so as to produce a desire to be saved.]

X. [*Of Idolatry.*

The worship of idols, images, or pictures, the likeness of any thing in heaven or in earth, the work of men's hands, the sun, moon, or stars, angels, saints, or any creature as God, or gods, is strictly forbidden in the word of God.]

XI. [*Of the Worship of God.*

The worship of God, to be acceptable to him, must be in spirit and in truth; the heart being truly penitent and fixed solely on Him as the only source of true happiness, and the object of divine homage, on whom alone we depend for grace, mercy, and salvation:]

XII. [*Of the Holy Scriptures.*

The sacred canon being full and complete, in the Old and New Testaments, all pretended new or additional revelations from God, or spirits, are spurious, deceptive, and to be rejected as repugnant to God's word.]

XIII. *The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.*

The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scriptures, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

The Names of the Canonical Books.

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the First Book of Samuel, the Second Book of

Samuel, the First Book of Kings, the Second Book of Kings, the First Book of Chronicles, the Second Book of Chronicles, the Book of Ezra, the Book of Nehemiah, the Book of Esther, the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less: all the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical.

XIV. *Of the Old Testament.*

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

XV. [*Of the Sabbath, or Lord's Day.*

As the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, was observed, by Divine command, in commemoration of the finishing of the work of creation and God's resting on that day, so the first day of the week, called the Lord's Day, was observed by the apostles of Christ and the primitive Church *in memorium* of Christ's resurrection, or finishing the work of redemption, and should be observed as holy and a day of rest from secular labor or recreation, but of devotion to and the worship of God.]

XVI. *Of Original or Birth Sin.*

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

Samuel, the First Book of Kings, the Second Book of Kings, the First Book of Chronicles, the Second Book of Chronicles, the Book of Ezra, the Book of Nehemiah, the Book of Esther, the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less: all the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical.

XIV. *Of the Old Testament.*

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

XV. [*Of the Sabbath, or Lord's Day.*

As the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, was observed, by Divine command, in commemoration of the finishing of the work of creation and God's resting on that day, so the first day of the week, called the Lord's Day, was observed by the apostles of Christ and the primitive Church in remembrance of Christ's resurrection, as finishing the work of redemption, and should be observed as holy and a day of rest from secular labor or recreation, but of devotion to and the worship of God.]

XVI. *Of Original or Birth Sin.*

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

XVII. [*Of the Depravity of Man.*

The depravity of man after the fall, and before the atonement, was total, so that he had no power or strength whereby to regain the lost favor and image of God; but through the atonement of Christ a manifestation of the Spirit was given to every man, whereby all may repent and believe unto salvation.]

XVIII. *Of Free Will.*

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

XIX. [*Of Fore-Ordination.*

Although God foreknows all things whatsoever that come to pass, as also what *might* or *ought* to come to pass, yet hath he not predestinated, fore-ordained, or decreed any human action conflicting with man's free agency, or impairing his free will or his responsibility to God.]

XX. [*Of Election.*

The doctrine of the eternal, unconditional, election or reprobation of men or angels is repugnant to the word of God, and dangerous to be believed, or relied upon for salvation. The election or choice of God of believers is not from eternity unconditionally, but "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," preceded by repentance and pardon of sin.]

XXI. [*Of Final Apostasy.*

The election of believers may be forfeited and lost by sin, so that the apostate may finally perish. The dogma that "being once in grace, the subject of it cannot so fall away as to finally perish," is deceptive, and endangers the salvation of those who believe and trust in it for that end.]

XXII. *Of the Justification of Man.*

We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our

own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

XXIII. [*Of Regeneration.*

Justification, or the acquittal from the guilt of sin, is an act of mercy done *for* us in the forgiveness of sin. Sanctification is an act of mercy done *in* us, whereby we are cleansed from sin by the blood of Christ. Regeneration, or the new birth, which occurs at justification, is the renewal of our moral natures, whereby we become the children of God by adoption.]

XXIV. [*Of the Witness of the Spirit.*

All who are justified, adopted, regenerated, or sanctified, through faith in Christ, are assured thereof by the Spirit of God witnessing with their spirits that they are his children.]

XXV. [*Of Perfect Love.*

Although man cannot become as perfect as God, angels, or Adam before he fell, nor perfect in knowledge nor in judgment, yet he may become perfect in love to God. Perfect love is attained in sanctification, being thereby cleansed from inward impurities, through faith in Christ.]

XXVI. *Of Good Works.*

Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgments, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

XXVII. *Of Works of Supererogation.*

Voluntary works, besides, over and above, God's commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

XXIII. [*Of Regeneration.*

Justification, or the acquittal from the guilt of sin, is an act of mercy done *for us* in the forgiveness of sin. Sanctification is an act of mercy done *in us*, whereby we are cleansed from sin by the blood of Christ. Regeneration, or the new birth, which occurs at justification, is the renewal of our moral natures, whereby we become the children of God by adoption.]

XXIV. [*Of the Witness of the Spirit.*

All who are justified, adopted, regenerated, or sanctified, through faith in Christ, are assured thereof by the Spirit of God witnessing with their spirits that they are his children.]

XXV. [*Of Perfect Love.*

Although man cannot become as perfect as God, angels, or Adam before he fell, nor perfect in knowledge nor in judgment, yet he may become perfect in love to God. Perfect love is attained in sanctification, being thereby cleansed from inward impurities, through faith in Christ.]

XXVI. *Of Good Works.*

Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgments, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

XXVII. *Of Works of Supererogation.*

Voluntary works, besides, over and above, God's commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, *When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.*

XXVIII. *Of Sin after Justification.*

Not every sin willingly committed after justification is the n against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, e grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into n after justification: after we have received the Holy Ghost, e may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, rise again and amend our lives. And therefore ey are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as ong as they live here; or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

XXIX. *Of the Church.*

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful en, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the craments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, n all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. [Sunday-schools, in which the pure Gospel is taught, appertain the Church, and should be sustained thereby.]

XXX. [*Of Church Government.*

In the government of the Church we acknowledge Christ as e head and sovereign lawgiver, whose laws are the only rule, d a sufficient rule, from which alone all articles of faith and les of moral discipline should be drawn.]

XXXI. [*Of the Ministry.*

The ministry of the Gospel, as instituted by Christ, are ved by the Holy Ghost, and specially called of God thereto, d no man rightfully taketh this office upon himself except he alled of God, as was Aaron. This ministry, by Christ's mmandment, is necessarily itinerant, being commissioned to into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, have the oversight of the Church as the pastors thereof.]

XXXII. [*Of the Unity of the Church.*

The primitive Church, though in separate local organiza-, were united by ecclesiastical connections, under apostolic pal supervision, so as to have one common faith and al discipline, adopted by the apostles and elders, which

model should be observed, as far as circumstances will admit of it, irrespective of national boundaries, leaving local Churches to manage local matters within those general rules of faith and practice.]

XXXIII. [*Of the Means of Grace.*

The ordinary means of grace, instituted of God, are the preaching of the Gospel, exhortation, reading his word, prayer, faith, praise, and the assembling for his worship, and the Lord's Supper. Penances and personal tortures of any kind are repugnant to the word of God, and useless in this matter.]

XXXIV. *Of Purgatory.*

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardon, worshiping and adoration as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God.

XXXV. *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People understand.*

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people.

XXXVI. *Of the Sacraments.*

Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have partly grown out of the *corrupt* following of the apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's

Supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi, 29.

XXXVII. *Of Baptism.*

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also [in adults] a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.

XXXVIII. [*Of the Moral State of Infants.*

The moral condition of infants being that of "justification unto life," they are entitled to the sign of that grace; and such as die in that state are saved through the atonement of Christ, being, as Christ saith, "of the kingdom of heaven."]

XXXIX. [*Of the Mode of Baptism.*

Baptism being "the answer of a good conscience," the mode or form of it should be left to the choice of the subject, if adult, or to the parent or guardian, if infant.]

XL. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

Supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi, 29.

XXXVII. *Of Baptism.*

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also [in adults] a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.

XXXVIII. [*Of the Moral State of Infants.*

The moral condition of infants being that of "justification unto life," they are entitled to the sign of that grace; and such as die in that state are saved through the atonement of Christ, being, as Christ saith, "of the kingdom of heaven."]

XXXIX. (*Of the Mode of Baptism.*

Baptism being "the answer of a good conscience," the mode or form of it should be left to the choice of the subject, if adult, or to the parent or guardian, if infant.)

XL. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped.

XLI. *Of Both Kinds.*

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's Supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christians alike.

XLII. [*Of Open or Free Communion.*

In the communion of the Lord's Supper we invite the Lord's people without respect to denominational peculiarities. Those who sincerely repent of their sins, and believe in the divinity of the atonement, may be admitted to this sacrament.]

XLIII. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*

The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in the which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.

XLIV. [*Of Marriage.*

The marriage of one man to one woman is a holy and honorable estate, and was instituted of God, in the time of man's innocency, for the mutual happiness and lawful propagation of our race. It is a moral, as well as civil and social, relation, and should be subject to the laws of God as well as those of the State.]

XLV. *Of the Marriage of Ministers.*

The ministers of Christ are not commanded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christians, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve best to godliness.

XLVI. *Of Rites and Ceremonies of Churches.*

It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the rites and ceremonies of the Church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the word of God, and are ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like, as one that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

Every particular Church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification.

XLVII. *Of the Rulers of the United States of America.*

[Civil government is a divine institution, therefore we recognize that] the President, the Congress, the General Assemblies, the Governors, and the Councils of State, *as the delegates of the people*, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States, and by the Constitution of their respective States. And the said States are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction. As far as it respects civil affairs, it is the duty of Christians, and especially of Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be, (except when in conflict with the word of God, as when requiring idolatry;) and therefore it is expected that all our preachers and people, who may be under the British or any other government, will behave themselves as peaceable subjects.]

XLVIII. [*Of Obedience to Government.*

Although we are forbidden to kill any human being in anger or revenge, yet in obedience to the civil laws or magistrate, who is God's minister, Christian men may execute sentence of death upon criminals, or kill enemies in a just and lawful war, or in defense of life when no other means of escape are apparent.]

XLIX. *Of Christian Men's Goods.*

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and the possession of same, as some do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

L. *Of a Christian Man's Oath.*

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, and judgment, and truth.*

Art. V.—MINISTERIAL EDUCATION IN OUR CHURCH.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

Address to the Clergy. By Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Presbyter of the Church of England: Works, Vol. VI, pp. 217–231.——*Address to the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New England by the Convention of Ministers and Members, held in Boston April* 24, 25, 1839, *to consider the expediency of establishing a Methodist Theological Institution.*——*Contributions and Editorials relative to the proposed Theological Seminary.* [More than a hundred, *pro* and *con.*] Zion's Herald. Boston: 1839–40.——*Ministerial Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church.* By Rev. S. M. Vail, D.D. Boston: 1853.——*A Treatise on the Need of the Methodist Episcopal Church with respect to her Ministry.* By Rev. R. S. Foster, D.D. New York: 1855.——*A Defense of the Present Mode of Training Candidates for the Ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* By Rev. J. H. Perry, D.D. New York: 1855.——*Nine Letters on Ministerial Education.* By W. F. W. Christian Advocate and Journal: Vol. XXXIII.——*Educational Qualifications for the Ministry.* By Rev. Dr. Nadal. Methodist Quarterly Review: April, 1867.——*Supply and Qualifications for the Ministry.* Three Essays by Rev. Messrs. E. S. Stanley, E. F. Clark, and W. F. Warren. Report of First Rhode Island Convention. Providence: 1870.——*The Sword and Garment; or, Ministerial Culture.* By Rev. L. T. Townsend, D.D. Boston: 1871.——*Educational Reports and Documents in Journal of General Conference,* 1864 *and* 1868.——*Addresses at the Dedication of Heck Hall, Evanston, July* 13, 1867, *and at the Opening of Drew Theological Seminary, November* 6, 1867.——*Annual Reports of the Boston Theological Seminary,* 1868–1872.

There is in this country one theological school of special interest. It is the largest in the world. Its last Freshman class numbered seven hundred and ninety-three. The entire number of students now in attendance is about three thousand.

---

* Our publication of this article implies no opinion as to the desirableness of New Articles.—Ed.

XLIX. Of Christian Men's Goods.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and the possession of same, as some do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

L. Of a Christian Man's Oath.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, and judgment, and truth.*

ART. V.—MINISTERIAL EDUCATION IN OUR CHURCH.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

Address to the Clergy. By Rev. JOHN WESLEY, M.A., Presbyter of the Church of England: Works, Vol. VI, pp. 217–231.——*Address to the Members and Friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New England by the Convention of Ministers and Members, held at Boston April 24, 25, 1839, to consider the expediency of establishing a Methodist Theological Institution.*——Considerations and Objections relative to the proposed Theological Seminary. [illegible] Zion's Herald, Boston: 1853–4.——*Ministerial Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church.* By Rev. S. M. VAIL, D.D. Boston: 1853.——*A Treatise on the Need of the Methodist Episcopal Church with respect to her Ministry.* By Rev. [illegible], D.D. New York: 1853.——*A* [illegible] *for the Ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* By Rev. [illegible], D.D. New York, 1853.——*New Lectures on Ministerial Education.* By W. F. W. Christian Advocate and Journal. Vol. XXXIII.——*Educational Qualifications for the Ministry.* By Rev. DR. NADAL. Methodist Quarterly Review: April, 1861.——*Supply and Qualifications for the Ministry.* Three Essays by Rev. Messrs. [illegible]. Report of First [illegible] Convention. Providence, 1870.——[illegible] By Rev. [illegible]. Boston, 1871.——*Educational Reports and Statements in Minutes of* [illegible] *Conferences, 1864 and 1868.*——*Addresses at the Dedication of* [illegible] *Hall, July 12, 1867, and at the Opening of Drew Theological Seminary, November 6, 1867.*——*Annual Reports of the Boston Theological Seminary, 1868–1871.*

THERE is in this country one theological school of special interest. It is the largest in the world. Its last freshman class numbered seven hundred and ninety-three. The entire number of students now in attendance is about three thousand

---

*Our publication of this article implies no opinion as to the desirableness of New Articles.—Ed.

While other theological institutions, the world over, have required but a brief three years' course of study, this one has from the beginning prescribed four years. While other seminaries surrender a quarter of the year for vacation, this one is in uninterrupted operation from one year's end to the other. For more than half a century fresh classes have been organized almost every month, and after completing their four years' curriculum have graduated with fitting honors. Its alumni, living and dead, are already numbered by tens of thousands. Its campus is broader than the continent.

This grandest of theological seminaries is the Methodist Episcopal Church. From the beginning this Church has deliberately and intelligently undertaken the work of such a seminary. At the outset she proposed to educate her own ministers, and in her own way. She developed her system with the same wise reference to providential circumstances which distinguished her in other departments of Christian effort. As soon as thoroughly elaborated it was formally incorporated into the law of the Church. This was done by the General Conference of 1816. At that time, when as yet there was but one theological seminary in the whole land, the Methodist Episcopal Church instructed her highest dignitaries to elaborate and prescribe a uniform and appropriate course of theological study for all her candidates. She charged another class of officers, scattered throughout the entire connection, to see that the curriculum was mastered. She provided for annual examinations, and enacted a law that no student could be graduated, and receive the parchment of deacon or elder, until he should have passed the prescribed examinations in a manner satisfactory to the authorities. Those enactments of 1816 have remained almost unchanged in the law-book of the Church from that day to this.* In theory they cover every feature of

---

* "It shall be the duty of the bishops, or of a committee which they may appoint, at each Annual Conference, to point out a course of reading and study proper to be pursued by candidates for the ministry; and the presiding elder, whenever such are presented to him, shall direct them to those studies which have been thus recommended. And before any such candidate is received into full connection he shall give satisfactory evidence respecting his knowledge of those particular subjects which have been recommended to his consideration."—*Discipline*, 1816.

In the edition of 1868 these enactments are found in the following form. 1. The

While other theological institutions, the world over, have required but a brief three years' course of study, this one has from the beginning prescribed four years. While other seminaries surrender a quarter of the year for vacation, this one is in uninterrupted operation from one year's end to the other. For more than half a century fresh classes have been organized almost every month, and after completing their four years' curriculum have graduated with fitting honors. Its alumni, living and dead, are already numbered by tens of thousands. Its campus is broader than the continent.

This grandest of theological seminaries is the Methodist Episcopal Church. From the beginning this Church has deliberately and intelligently undertaken the work of such a seminary. At the outset she purposed to educate her own ministers, and in her own way. She developed her system with the same wise reference to providential circumstances which distinguished her in other departments of Christian effort. As soon as thoroughly elaborated it was formally incorporated into the law of the Church. This was done by the General Conference of 1816. At that time, when as yet there was but one theological seminary in the whole land, the Methodist Episcopal Church instructed her highest dignitaries to elaborate and prescribe a uniform and appropriate course of theological study for all her candidates. She charged another class of officers, scattered throughout the entire connection, to see that the curriculum was mastered. She provided for annual examinations, and enacted a law that no student could be graduated, and receive the parchment of deacon or elder, until he should have passed the prescribed examinations in a manner satisfactory to the authorities. These enactments of 1816 have remained almost unchanged in the law book of the Church from that day to this.* In theory they cover every feature of

---

* "It shall be the duty of the Bishops, or of a committee which they may appoint, at each Annual Conference, to point out a course of reading and study proper to be pursued by candidates for the ministry; and the presiding elder, whenever such are presented to him, shall direct them to those studies which have been recommended. And before any such candidate is received into full connection he shall give satisfactory evidence respecting his knowledge of those particular subjects which have been recommended to his consideration."—*Discipline*, 1816.

In the edition of 1868 these enactments are found in the following form. 1. The

the most thoroughly organized ministerial training school. There are officers to prescribe the course of study and the conditions of admission to it; others to examine applicants and to decide upon their qualifications; others to have oversight of the students' studies and to see that the course is thoroughly mastered. There are not only entrance examinations, but also sessional ones at the close of every year. On completing the course the successful pupil receives not only a diploma, but also a situation with the prospect of a profitable life-long employment. What clerical seminary ever had a more perfect organization?

Here, then, we have a system of ministerial education, differing widely from the State-Church Protestant system on the one hand and from the Roman Catholic upon the other. It is unique, *sui generis;* it is the distinctively Methodistic system. Let us look at some of its fundamental principles.

I. It is based upon the idea *that the professional instruction and training of the ministry ought to be in the hands of the Church.*

In many of life's callings it matters not where or by whom recruits are trained, provided only their training is thorough. The merchant cares little where his accountants may have studied book-keeping, so they only understand it. The public concerns itself but little with the question, By whom was this lawyer or physician educated? The main question is, *What* is he now that his education is finished? So of most secular vocations.

But while this is true of so many callings, it is also evident that where a social body requires the life-service of a class of men, it will be greatly to its advantage to have the control of

---

duty of the bishops: "To prescribe a course of study in English literature and in science, upon which those applying for admission upon trial in the Annual Conferences shall be examined and approved before sucha dmission; and also to prescribe a course of reading and study proper to be pursued by candidates for the ministry for a term of four years."—*P.* 95. 2. Duty of the presiding elder: "To direct the candidates who are admitted on trial to those studies which have been recommended by the bishops."—*P.* 95. 3. Requirement that the candidate pass the prescribed examination: "But before any such candidate is received on trial, or into full connection, or ordained deacon or elder, he shall give satisfactory evidence respecting his knowledge of those particular subjects which have been recommended to his consideration."—*P.* 84.

the most thoroughly organized ministerial training school. There are officers to prescribe the course of study and the conditions of admission to it; others to examine applicants and to decide upon their qualifications; others to have oversight of the students' studies and to see that the course is thoroughly mastered. There are not only entrance examinations, but also sessional ones at the close of every year. On completing the course the successful pupil receives not only a diploma, but also a situation with the prospect of a profitable life-long employment. What clerical seminary ever had a more perfect organization?

Here, then, we have a system of ministerial education, differing widely from the State-Church Protestant system on the one hand and from the Roman Catholic upon the other. It is unique, *sui generis*; it is the distinctively Methodistic system. Let us look at some of its fundamental principles.

I. It is based upon the idea *that the professional instruction and training of the ministry ought to be in the hands of the Church.*

In many of life's callings it matters not where or by whom recruits are trained, provided only their training is thorough. The merchant cares little where his accountants may have studied book-keeping, so they only understand it. The public concerns itself but little with the question, By whom was this lawyer or physician educated? The main question is, What is he now that his education is finished? So of most secular vocations.

But while this is true of so many callings, it is also evident that where a social body requires the life-service of a class of men, it will be greatly to its advantage to have the control of

---

duty of the bishops: "To prescribe a course of study in English literature and in science, upon which those applying for admission upon trial in the Annual Conferences shall be examined and approved before being admitted; and also to prescribe a course of reading and study proper to be pursued by candidates for the ministry for a term of four years."—¶ 65. 2. Duty of the examining committee: "To examine candidates who are admitted on trial in those studies which have been recommended by the bishops."—¶ 83. 3. Requirement that the candidate pass the prescribed examinations: "But before any such candidate is received on trial, or into full connection, or ordained deacon or elder, he shall give satisfactory evidence respecting his knowledge of those particular subjects which have been recommended to his consideration."—¶ 84.

their training. A nation would be thought demented which should intrust the education of its military officers to foreign powers, however friendly. No Government is willing to intrust such high and responsible work even to its own citizens, except under direct govermental supervision, in institutions maintained by the Government. The reason is this: The highest efficiency in this branch of the public service depends not merely upon knowledge, but even more upon a certain spirit of devotion to the honor and well-being of the nation. To secure this patriotic spirit in her future defenders the country needs a direct oversight of their education, an immediate and unique relation to them. This is the philosophy, this the vindication, of special military and naval academies established and maintained by the Government in our own and other lands.

Now what we have just said of the servants of the State is yet more strikingly true of the ministers of the Christian Church. Their highest efficiency is even more dependent upon their spirit than is that of the soldier. Without complete sympathy with the Church no man can effectively perform the work of the Church. He may have the highest theological learning, the most consummate rhetorical skill, the most showy oratorical gifts, and yet without intimate and subtile sympathy with the Church, with her doctrines, her methods, her LIFE, all will not give success. This sympathy, however, can be developed only in the atmosphere of the Church, in a vital relation to her. It can be most perfectly developed only in the plastic years of a man's life. To secure, therefore, the most efficient ministry, ministerial training must be the work of the Church herself.

On this point, then, we vindicate our Methodist position, on the one hand over-against the State-Church Protestant system, which makes ministerial education the function of the State, and on the other hand, over-against the system which leaves the work to schools owned and managed by close corporations independent of ecclesiastical control. We vindicate it on grounds of reason, by appeals to the precedents of the best periods of church history, by the crucial tests of practical experience. Whatever modifications the future may bring, may it never wrest the training of our ministry from the legitimate and effective control of the Church!

II. The system adopted by our fathers *proposed to train for*

the ministry no man whom God had not called to the ministry. This was its second fundamental principle.

The authors of this system believed in a special divine call to the work of the ministry. They regarded the true call as coming directly from God, and as requiring the joint ratification of the man and of the Church. This Methodistic theory of the ministerial call necessarily demanded three things in a system of ministerial education. First, as it vindicated to the Church the right and duty of pronouncing upon the qualifications of the candidate both as to gifts and graces, it by a logical necessity demanded in its system of ministerial education provision for legitimate ecclesiastical control. Of this feature we have just spoken. Secondly, in making man's acceptance of God's call a free ethical act of the individual, the Methodist theory of ministerial vocation affirmed the essential freedom of the human soul, and jealously guarded responsible personal agency. In logical consistency, therefore, it could but demand a system of ministerial education which should do the same. Such a theory of the call cannot, in the nature of the case, be satisfied with any system which tends to destroy, or even weaken, in the student the consciousness of personal freedom and the sense of personal responsibility. It wants, not puppets, parrots, apes, functionaries; it wants MEN. Any system, therefore, which aims to educate ministers answering to the Methodistic ideal must be broad enough to include all genuine man-making culture, high enough to afford growing-room to even the thriftiest characters.

But, finally, this theory of the call necessarily demanded of its system of ministerial training that it restrict itself to legitimate subjects; that is, to those who have been called of God to the work of the ministry, and whose divine call has been accepted and ratified by the individual and by the Church. It could not, like the Romish theory, allow the Church to pick her own men, for this would be interfering with God's prerogative. It could not, like the State-Church Protestant theory, accept of all who might offer, for "no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Here again, therefore, our historic system of ministerial education is right, the Romish and State-Church Protestant wrong.

III. The system inaugurated by our fathers *provided for a*

happy blending of the theoretical and practical in ministerial education.

As to the practical element in the training of our fathers, no one can question its wonderful efficiency. It was superior to any thing ever furnished in any other branch of the Church. So long as the old circuit system prevailed, each preacher enjoyed a practical apprenticeship far superior to any thing which ordinary schools can possibly offer. That system perfectly met the subjective and objective conditions of a *practical* evangelistic training-school of the highest efficiency. The senior preacher or presiding elder was the living instructor. To the inexperienced beginner he was at the same time the living model. He taught, not so much by text-book as by familiar lecture and practical exemplification. It was "object-teaching" on a grand scale. Having been through the same experiences himself, he knew when to cheer his faint-hearted and discouraged disciple—also when to take down his self-conceit. What impresses of power and of personal peculiarity these old heroes left upon the young men under their care! Scarce a preacher of that period of our Church has left a record of his life behind without grateful commemoration of his indebtedness to some presiding elder or senior associate in his earliest circuits.

Nor let any man lightly depreciate the *theoretical* part of the Methodist minister's education fifty years ago. *At that time* the works studied by our candidates were among the latest and best in the English language. Fifty years ago, in breadth of biblical and general scholarship, Adam Clarke held a pre-eminence over all contemporaries, British or American, such as no man has since enjoyed. He has been called by men of other communions "the most universal scholar of his age." His Commentary was then to other commentaries far more than Lange's or "The Speaker's" is to-day. What theology was being taught fifty years ago in Andover and Bangor and Princeton we now know from the published works of their respective professors. With all respect for those professors we may unhesitatingly assert that Watson's Institutes presented an abler body of divinity than they. Fletcher was at that date more invigorating, more a writer for the times, than Bushnell is to-day. The questions so masterfully handled in his "Checks" were then as much the living issues of the day as Darwinism *happy blending of the theoretical and practical in ministerial education.*

As to the practical element in the training of our fathers, no one can question its wonderful efficiency. It was superior to any thing ever furnished in any other branch of the Church. So long as the old circuit system prevailed, each preacher enjoyed a practical apprenticeship far superior to any thing which ordinary schools can possibly offer. That system perfectly met the subjective and objective conditions of a practical evangelistic training-school of the highest efficiency. The senior preacher or presiding elder was the living instructor. To the inexperienced beginner he was at the same time the living model. He taught, not so much by text-book as by familiar lecture and practical exemplification. It was "object teaching" on a grand scale. Having been through the same experiences himself, he knew when to cheer his faint-hearted and discouraged disciple—also when to take down his self-conceit. What impresses of power and of personal peculiarity these old heroes left upon the young men under their care! Scarce a preacher of that period of our Church has left a record of his life behind without grateful commemoration of his indebtedness to some presiding elder or senior associate in his earliest circuits.

Nor let any man lightly depreciate the *theoretical* part of the Methodist minister's education fifty years ago. *At that time* the works studied by our candidates were among the latest and best in the English language. Fifty years ago, in breadth of biblical and general scholarship, Adam Clarke held a preeminence over all contemporaries, British or American, such as no man has since enjoyed. He has been called by men of other communions "the most universal scholar of his age." His Commentary was then to other commentaries far more than Lange's or "The Speaker's" is to-day. What theology was being taught fifty years ago in Andover and Bangor and Princeton, we now know from the published works of their respective professors. With all respect for these professors we may unhesitatingly assert that Watson's Institutes presented an abler body of divinity than they. Fletcher was at that date more invigorating, more a writer for the times, than Bushnell is to-day. The questions so masterfully handled in the "Checks" were then as much the living issues of the day as Darwinism and Positivism are at the present time. Döllinger, the leader of the grand movement now in progress among the German Catholics against the decree of papal infallibility, in his work entitled, "*Kirche und Kirchen*,"[*] asserts that the writings of Fletcher, of Madeley, are in some respects the most important which the English theological literature of their period can show. These writings were only a part of the doctrinal text-books of our Methodist fathers. Wesley's Sermons, which they also studied so thoroughly, had at that time a freshness and vitality, and even novelty, which neither Beecher's nor Robertson's will possess the same number of years after the death of their authors. His other writings had the strength and charm, not only of unusual spiritual insight, but also of freshest and broadest scholarship. He was the first man to lift Protestant English theology out of its provincialism, and to give it its present cosmopolitan breadth of vision. He studied every literature of Christendom and inspired others to do the same. In the love for German literature he was the great pioneer of his nation. The wonderful interest now felt in this study among all English-speaking populations is primarily due, not to Coleridge, not to Carlyle, but to John Wesley. This is the testimony of unprejudiced investigators. In his work on Pantheism, John Hunt remarks that Wesley was the first English divine to introduce German theology into England.[†] Others have remarked the same fact. Indeed, it is doubtful whether, with all the increased facilities, the Church of England has to-day a man more thoroughly familiar with contemporaneous thought and literature in all parts of Christendom than was in his day that loyal son of hers whose name she has so long cast out as evil. Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, and Watson constituted a theological faculty of which any university in the world might justly have been proud. Fifty or sixty years ago, therefore, in all his prescribed studies the candidate for our ministry was brought in contact with the latest biblical science, the best principles of interpretation, the most vital questions of contemporary doctrine, and the most undeniable masters of pulpit power. So far as *denominational* text-books for biblical, theological, and

---

[*] "*Das Bedeutendste, was die damalige theologische Literatur England's aufzuweisen hat.*"

[†] "Essay on Pantheism," p. 309.

and Positivism are at the present time. Döllinger, the leader of the grand movement now in progress among the German Catholics against the decree of papal infallibility, in his work entitled, "*Kirche und Kirchen*," asserts that the writings of Fletcher, of Madeley, are in some respects the most important which the English theological literature of their period can show.* These writings were only a part of the doctrinal text-books of our Methodist fathers. Wesley's Sermons, which they also studied so thoroughly, had at that time a freshness and vitality, and even novelty, which neither Beecher's nor Robertson's will possess the same number of years after the death of their authors. His other writings had the strength and charm, not only of unusual spiritual insight, but also of ripest and broadest scholarship. He was the first man to lift Protestant English theology out of its provincialism, and to give it its present cosmopolitan breadth of vision. He studied every literature of Christendom and inspired others to do the same. In his love for German literature he was the great pioneer of his nation. The wonderful interest now felt in its study among all English-speaking populations is primarily due, not to Coleridge, not to Carlyle, but to John Wesley. This is the testimony of unprejudiced investigators. In his work on Pantheism, John Hunt remarks that Wesley was the first English divine to introduce German theology into England.† Others have remarked the same fact. Indeed, it is doubtful whether, with all the increased facilities, the Church of England has to-day a man more thoroughly familiar with contemporaneous thought and literature in all parts of Christendom than was in his day that loyal son of hers whose name she has so long cast out as evil. Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, and Watson constituted a theological faculty of which any university in the world might justly have been proud. Fifty or sixty years ago, therefore, in all the prescribed studies the candidate for our ministry was brought in contact with the latest biblical science, the best principles of interpretation, the most vital questions of contemporary doctrine, and the most undeniable masters of pulpit power. So far as denominational text-books for biblical, theological, and practical study are concerned, the Methodist student was relatively far better off fifty years ago than he is to-day.

---

* "Das Bedeutendste, was die damalige englische theologische Literatur [illegible] aufzuweisen hat."

† "Essay on Pantheism," p. 305.

But the beauty of this system of training was that it so happily combined the thoeretical and practical. How to do this has been a grave problem with all educators of ministers. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné was one day deploring to a table-guest the failure, in this respect, of the European, or State-Church Protestant system. The writer explained to him, by way of contrast, the system established by the founders of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and he at once declared himself charmed with its model excellence. It interpreted to him for the first time the mystery of the history of Methodism.

About a generation ago a great change occurred in the practical working of our ecclesiastical system. Through all the older and more settled portions of the Church the circuit system was generally abandoned. The gravity of this change has seldom, if ever, been duly estimated. Measured by its effects upon the whole Church, it is entitled to be designated a radical revolution.

The first and most serious result of this revolution was the practical paralysis of our whole system of ministerial training. The great theological seminary of Methodism was not indeed closed, but it received a blow equivalent to that which would be dealt to a college by abolishing its working faculty. Imagine the Wesleyan University so situated. Let the buildings be open to students, but no provision be made for instructing them. Let them be given to understand that the old plan or course of study remains the same; that they are to grapple with it and master it; that at the close of each year a committee will come to see what progress they have made, and at the close of the course to give them a diploma. What kind of education should we be likely to secure by such a process?

Not less disastrous in its effects upon ministerial training in our Church was the abolition of the circuit system. It effectually deprived our candidates and junior ministry of the instruction, drill, and personal influence which they had been wont to receive from their senior associates upon the district and circuit. It robbed them of the stimulus and profit of contact with superior minds, the advantages of living models, the blessed contagion of maturer character. It deprived them of practical study are concerned, the Methodist student was relatively far better off fifty years ago than he is to-day.

But the beauty of this system of training was that it so happily combined the theoretical and practical. How to do this has been a grave problem with all educators of ministers. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné was one day deploring to a table-guest the failure, in this respect, of the European, or State-Church Protestant system. The writer explained to him, by way of contrast, the system established by the founders of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and he at once declared himself charmed with its model excellence. It interpreted to him for the first time the mystery of the history of Methodism.

About a generation ago a great change occurred in the practical working of our ecclesiastical system. Through all the older and more settled portions of the Church the circuit system was generally abandoned. The gravity of this change has seldom, if ever, been duly estimated. Measured by its effects upon the whole Church, it is entitled to be designated a radical revolution.

The first and most serious result of this revolution was the practical paralysis of our whole system of ministerial training. The great theological seminary of Methodism was not indeed closed, but it received a blow equivalent to that which would be dealt to a college by abolishing its working faculty. Imagine the Wesleyan University so situated. Let the buildings be open to students, but no provision be made for instructing them. Let them be given to understand that the old plan or course of study remains the same; that they are to grapple with it and master it; that at the close of each year a committee will come to see what progress they have made, and at the close of the course to give them a diploma. What kind of education should we be likely to secure by such a process?

Not less disastrous in its effects upon ministerial training in our Church was the abolition of the circuit system. It effectually deprived our candidates and junior ministers of the instruction, drill, and personal influence which they had been wont to receive from their senior associates upon the districts and circuit. It robbed them of the stimulus and profit of contact with superior minds, the advantages of living models, the blessed contagion of maturer character. It deprived them of the inspiration of new and changing scenes, the spur of fresh congregations, the healthful exercise of equestrian travel, the opportunity for "licking discourses into shapes of fire by judicious repetition." By appointing him to one little station and rolling upon him the whole burden of a settled pastor, the new system took away from the young man not only his instructors, but even the time for study which he before enjoyed. The illustration of the university deprived of its faculty falls far short of the truth in this respect. To render it complete it is necessary to add the further supposition that the university students are robbed of leisure for study and the stimulus of mutual association. Imagine a college with no faculty, its students so scattered that no two can meet and study together, each student in a treadmill twelve hours of each day, and you have a pretty faithful picture of the great Methodist Ministerial Training School as affected by the transition from the circuit to the station system.*

In studying this great change one fact becomes more and more unaccountable. It is that a third of a century should have been permitted to lapse away without witnessing any earnest

---

*The fathers in New England saw all this more than thirty years ago. They even employed the self-same illustration which we have used above. They saw the "college" of the circuit "breaking up," and sought to find a remedy. The proof of these statements is found in the following language, which first met our eye after our article was in type: "The alterations in the work of the itinerancy will soon require that our ministers be prepared for the most important functions of their office before joining the traveling connection. Our fathers in the ministry were missionaries 'running to and fro' over the land to revive the great doctrines of experimental religion. The large circuits which were at first formed have, in the progress of the work, been divided into smaller circuits, and these again into stations, throughout the greater part of New England. These stations require instructed and experienced pastors. An inexperienced young man may, by close application, prepare himself to preach acceptably on the Sabbath; but he has other important duties to discharge. He is a judge in Israel—presiding at trials which involve the character and reputation of individuals and the interests of the Church. He must provide for the religious instruction of the young, must oversee the temporal and spiritual concerns of the Church, and direct and sustain all its moral and benevolent enterprises. Who, then, is sufficient for these things? Our Church has always practically answered, Not the young and inexperienced—and hence has given the charge of circuits to an Elder, who has borne the burden of government and been an instructor and counselor of the junior preachers. But this system is passing away, and these simple colleges are broken up."—*Address of the Boston Convention,* in 1839, *to consider the expediency of establishing a Methodist Theological Institution.*

effort on the part of the authorities of the Church to re-adjust her deranged machinery for ministerial training. Whatever has been done in this direction has resulted from the voluntary effort and sacrifice of private individuals and associations. But for the initiative taken by these, we have no reason to suppose that we should have to this day a theological school of any kind, or a solitary education society for the assistance of self-dependent candidates for our ministry. The old "Conference Course of Study" has indeed been revised, but not the slightest provision has been made by the authorities for instruction in it. Year after year young men of only common school-education are sent out by the hundred to solitary pastoral charges, where, without the least preliminary drill or preparation of material, they are required to preach twice or thrice a week, conduct social meetings, instruct Sunday-school workers, carry the whole pastoral management of the charge, represent their denomination in the usual capacities of a public man, sometimes even to build and pay for a church at the same time. In addition to all this without aid, counsel, books, time or acquired facility in study, they must master a year's work in a prescribed course of theological education. The result, in the case of many, is a break-down in health at the very outset; in the case of more, a hasty cramming three weeks before conference, and promotion to next year's standing after an examination intellectually and morally damaging in its influence. After a few such annual farces the course is duly completed and domestic relations settled, youth gone, and the sobered man suddenly wakes up to the fact that he has a solid life-work upon him for which he has no adequate preparation. Some, on making the discovery, turn aside to secular pursuits; some give up their work until, contending against fearful odds, they can go back to the schools and patch up the best education their matured powers will now admit of; others kill themselves in the vain attempt to redeem their loss by private application; while others plod on through life with a constant sense of failure, but trying to do the best they can under the circumstances, and often wishing the weary contest at an end. The tendency of the system in its present deranged condition is evidently to produce a ministry relatively weaker and less scholarly in rank and file than we had fifty years ago.

Nor is the result much, if any, better in those exceptional effort on the part of the authorities of the Church to readjust her deranged machinery for ministerial training. Whatever has been done in this direction has resulted from the voluntary effort and sacrifice of private individuals and associations. But for the initiative taken by these, we have no reason to suppose that we should have to this day a theological school of any kind, or a solitary education society for the assistance of self-dependent candidates for our ministry. The old "Conference Course of Study" has indeed been revised, but not the slightest provision has been made by the authorities for instruction in it. Year after year young men of only common school-education are sent out by the hundred to solitary pastoral charges, where, without the least preliminary drill or preparation of material, they are required to preach twice or thrice a week, conduct social meetings, instruct Sunday-school workers, carry the whole pastoral management of the charge, represent their denomination in the usual capacities of a public man, sometimes even to build and pay for a church at the same time. In addition to all this without aid, counsel, books, time or acquired facility in study, they must master a year's work in a prescribed course of theological education. The result, in the case of many, is a break-down in health at the very outset; in the case of more, a hasty cramming three weeks before conference, and promotion to next year's standing after an examination intellectually and morally damaging in its influence. After a few such annual farces the course is duly completed and domestic relations settled, youth gone, and the sobered man suddenly wakes up to the fact that he has a solid life-work upon him for which he has no adequate preparation. Some, on making the discovery, turn aside to secular pursuits; some give up their work until, contending against fearful odds, they can go back to the schools and patch up the best education their matured powers will now admit of; others kill themselves in the vain attempt to redeem their loss by private application; while others plod on through life with a constant sense of failure, but trying to do the best they can under the circumstances, and often wishing the weary contest at an end. The tendency of the system in its present deranged condition is evidently to produce a ministry relatively weaker and less scholarly in rank and file than we had fifty years ago. Nor is the result much, if any, better in those exceptional cases where the candidate comes directly from the college. As a rule these are of course possessed of more resources than the former class, and the undue draft upon their strength is not, perhaps, so likely to bankrupt them physically. This advantage, however, is often more than offset by the greater burdens and responsibilities of their first appointments. On the other hand many of these men need an efficient *molding*, even more than their less favored brethren. A consciously ignorant man is usually modest, and teaches nothing beyond what is taught by recognized authorities. A college-bred man, on the contrary, on his first emergence into public life, is apt to have a good opinion of his own wisdom and of his ability to "think for himself." An unschooled youth who has never entertained a moment's doubt of Richard Watson's absolute infallibility, is an infinitely safer man for the Church than that cultivated graduate who finds his chief theological inspiration in "Ecce Homo" and the "Old and New." Of all the crude, hazardous, paradoxical, unmethodistic statements of doctrine which the writer has ever heard from the Methodist pulpit, some of the worst have come from the lips of youthful preachers fresh from college. Not a few of these men ridicule their Conference text-books as antiquated, or as too simple to be worth their notice. Trusting to their recognized collegiate scholarship to carry them through the "examination," they scarce read one page in fifty of the prescribed curriculum. Even the theological smattering they do acquire is drawn, not from Methodist standards, but from the latest popular heresiarch of the press. The natural tendency of our present policy with this class is evidently to produce every variety of wild, eccentric, unmethodistic, and even semi-heretical notions which uninstructed individual speculation, stimulated by the popular clamor for originality, can beget. Such being the undeniable tendencies of our present system—if system it can be called—the grave question thrusts itself upon us, What is to be done to remedy so wretched and perilous a state of things?

A glance at the cause of all our troubles suggests the cure. Our whole embarrassment grew out of the abolition of an effective board of instruction for our junior ministry, it can be remedied only by substituting a new one. But what kind of a board shall it be? Under the old system each student had a cases where the candidate comes directly from the college. As a rule these are of *course* possessed of more resources than the former class, and the undue draft upon their strength is not, perhaps, so likely to bankrupt them physically. This advantage, however, is often more than offset by the greater burdens and responsibilities of their first appointments. On the other hand many of these men need an efficient schooling, even more than their less favored brethren. A consciously ignorant man is usually modest, and teaches nothing beyond what is taught by recognized authorities. A college-bred man, on the contrary, on his first emergence into public life, is apt to have a good opinion of his own wisdom and of his ability to "think for himself." An unschooled youth who has never entertained a moment's doubt of Richard Watson's absolute infallibility, is an infinitely safer man for the Church than that cultivated graduate who finds his chief theological inspiration in "Ecce Homo" and the "Old and New." Of all the crude, hazardous, paradoxical, unmethodistic statements of doctrine which the writer has ever heard from the Methodist pulpit, some of the worst have come from the lips of youthful preachers fresh from college. Not a few of these men ridicule their Conference textbooks as antiquated, or as too simple to be worth their notice. Trusting to their recognized collegiate scholarship to carry them through the "examination," they never read one page in fifty of the prescribed curriculum. Even the theological smattering they do acquire is drawn, not from Methodist standards, but from the latest popular heresiarch of the press. The natural tendency of our present policy with this class is evidently to produce every variety of wild, eccentric, unmethodistic, and even semi-heretical notions which unobstructed individual speculation, stimulated by the popular clamor for originality, can beget. Such being the undeniable tendencies of our present system—if system it can be called—the grave question thrusts itself upon us, What is to be done to remedy so wretched and perilous a state of things?

A glance at the cause of all our troubles suggests the cure. Our whole embarrassment grew out of the abolition of an effective board of instruction for our junior ministry; it can be remedied only by substituting a new one. But what kind of a board shall it be? Under the old system each student had a separate drill-master; this is no longer practicable. We have neither men nor means to give every young minister in his own little station a separate instructor. In some way, if we are to have instruction again, one must instruct many.

Shall we then organize all our stations supplied by men of less than four years' standing into educational circuits of suitable extent, and appoint a corps of teachers to statedly travel through each, instructing their younger brethren? This would be a great improvement upon our present practice. But is there not some plan more economical of time and labor and travel, as well as altogether more effectual in its results than even this? Is it not every way wiser and better to gather these young men themselves together at certain convenient centers, and there instruct and drill them for their future work? In this way the same teacher can instruct hundreds as easily as ten or one. In this way there can be a wise division of labor, so that of the corps of teachers each can devote himself to that particular branch in which he specially excels. On this plan, instead of a distinct teacher for each of our three thousand students, less than twenty can instruct and drill the whole. This is the idea, this the meaning, of our theological seminaries. They are not plagiarisms from other Churches; not attempted grafts from wild olive-trees; they are natural and normal outgrowths of our own ecclesiastical body, occasioned and justified by the downfall of our earlier system. *Substantially, they are merely select corps of instructors, conveniently distributed through the Church, to do for our junior ministry what the elders and senior circuit preachers did for them fifty years ago.* These seminaries, then, are the providential substitute for the lost teaching agency of our original system. By means of these we can re-adjust our long-disordered machinery, and resume the positive training of young men for our ministry.

Alas! what a struggle it has cost the friends of ministerial education to bring the Church to see this. Indeed, how far is the Church, as a whole, and even the ministry, from seeing it yet! First came the cry, These theological schools are "unmethodistic;" they are going to give us a "man-made ministry!" As well might one have cried out that our existing practice was giving us a "*self*-made ministry." Finally, after years of blind and foolish opposition, people were gradually separate drill master; this is no longer practicable. We have neither men nor means to give every young minister, in his own little station a separate instructor. In some way, if we are to have instruction again, one must instruct many.

Shall we then organize all our stations supplied by men of less than four years' standing into educational circuits of suitable extent, and appoint a corps of teachers to statedly travel through each, instructing their younger brethren? This would be a great improvement upon our present practice. But is there not some plan more economical of time and labor and travel, as well as altogether more effectual in its results than even this? Is it not every way wiser and better to gather these young men themselves together at certain convenient centers, and there instruct and drill them for their future work? In this way the same teacher can instruct hundreds as easily as ten or one. In this way there can be a wise division of labor, so that of the corps of teachers each can devote himself to that particular branch in which he specially excels. On this plan, instead of a distinct teacher for each of our three thousand students, less than twenty can instruct and drill the whole. This is the idea, this the meaning, of our theological seminaries. They are not plagiarisms from other Churches; not attempted grafts from wild olive-trees; they are natural and normal outgrowths of our own ecclesiastical body, occasioned and justified by the downfall of our earlier system. *Substantially, they are merely select corps of instructors, conveniently distributed through the Church, to do for our junior ministers what the elders and senior circuit preachers did for them fifty years ago.* These seminaries, then, are the providential substitute for the lost teaching agency of our original system. By means of these we can re-adjust our long-disordered machinery, and resume the positive training of young men for our ministry.

Ah! what a struggle it has cost the friends of ministerial education to bring the Church to see this. Indeed, how far is the Church, as a whole, and even the ministry, from seeing it yet! First came the cry, These theological schools are "un-Methodistic;" they are going to give us a "man-made ministry!" As well might one have cried out that our existing practice was giving us a "*self*-made ministry." Finally, after years of blind and foolish opposition, people were gradually made to understand that no theological school of the Methodist Episcopal Church ever proposed to admit to its instruction any candidate for the Methodist pulpit whose divine call has not been expressly indorsed by the proper quarterly conference. Thus this objection was at last exploded.

Then we were warned of the terrible uniformity and artificiality which would result from such a method of training. All our Elijahs and Isaiahs and Peters and Johns, sons of thunder and sons of consolation, run through one and the same "mill," would come out ground and filed and polished to one pattern, so similar in their lifeless, mechanical uniformity that their mothers would be unable to pick them out. These lachrymose prophets of evil forgot that the servile imitator is the man of narrow privileges, that the young man acted upon by many minds develops not only more symmetrically, but even more independently, than the one who is subjected to the exclusive influence of one commanding character. In this respect the influence of the senior preacher of the circuit over his youthful colleague was frequently not altogether favorable. The young man often reproduced the tones and mannerisms of his associate so perfectly as to be recognizable anywhere as a disciple of such or such an elder. These objectors to "minister mills" forgot that for years half of the young men in Dr. Bangs's conference carried their head on one shoulder, merely because that great man looked very wise and solemn in that involuntary attitude. They forgot that scores and hundreds of the personal pupils of Melancthon were noticed to carry one shoulder a little higher than the other in order that they might be the more perfect young Melancthons. It should have occurred to them that the true way to cure this servile imitation of single models is to bring together half a score of Melancthons, Bangses, Elijahs, Isaiahs, Boanerges, and Barnabi, and then let the young man, in his despair of copying all, learn that to equal any he must, like them, be true to himself. Then, while he will learn something from all, he will copy none. He will appropriate whatever he finds in each adapted to develop and nourish his own distinctive personality, while the keen and healthful criticism of fellow-students will keep him from those foolish and ridiculous eccentricities which would mar his future usefulness.

made to understand that no theological school of the Methodist Episcopal Church ever proposed to admit to its instruction any candidate for the Methodist pulpit whose divine call has not been expressly indorsed by the proper quarterly conference. Thus that objection was at last exploded.

Then we were warned of the terrible uniformity and artificiality which would result from such a method of training. All our Elijahs and Isaiahs and Peters and Johns, sons of thunder and sons of consolation, run through one and the same "mill," would come out ground and filed and polished to one pattern, so similar in their lifeless, mechanical uniformity that their mothers would be unable to pick them out. These lachrymose prophets of evil forget that the servile imitator is the man of narrow privileges, that the young man acted upon by many minds develops not only more symmetrically, but even more independently, than the one who is subjected to the exclusive influence of one commanding character. In this respect the influence of the senior preacher of the circuit over his youthful colleague was frequently not altogether favorable. The young man often reproduced the tones and mannerisms of his associate so perfectly as to be recognizable anywhere as a disciple of such or such an elder. These objectors to "minister mills" forgot that for years half of the young men in Dr. Bangs' conference carried their head on one shoulder, merely because that great man looked very wise and solemn in that inclinatory attitude. They forgot that scores and hundreds of the personal pupils of Melancthon were noticed to carry one shoulder a little higher than the other in order that they might be the more perfect young Melancthons. It should have occurred to them that the true way to cure this servile imitation of single models is to bring together half a score of Melancthons, Bangses, Elijahs, Isaiahs, Boanerges, and Barnabas, and then let the young man, in his despair of copying all, learn that to equal any he must, like them, be true to himself. Then, while he will learn something from all, he will copy none. He will appropriate whatever he finds in each adapted to develop and nourish his own distinctive personality, while the keen and healthful criticism of fellow-students will keep him from those foolish and ridiculous eccentricities which would mar his future usefulness.

Especially true is all this when the theological school is located in or near such great social centers as Boston, Chicago, and New York. In a city or surburban seminary the student hears half a dozen sermons from other men to one from his own homiletical professor. He has the advantage of studying a multitude of the leading living exemplars of his profession. He can analyze them individually, and search out the secret of their respective powers. He can compare, contrast, combine, select. He can cultivate a judgment of his own, an ideal of his own, a style of his own. His individuality is far safer than it was under the old circuit training; his naturalness far better guaranteed than when he is left to his own uncriticised awkwardnesses, or to the chance models of a secluded country station. This fact having found recognition at the hands of our last General Conference, and having been officially put forth by that august body as a conclusive and satisfactory answer to the objection we are noticing, we venture to hope that this ground of opposition to our theological seminaries is at last effectually removed. To thinking men it is rather transformed into a most potent argument for the institutional training of our coming ministry.

Then there was that other bugbear. Our doctrine, our discipline, who was to guarantee that in the proposed institutions these would be preserved and inculcated in their original Methodistic purity! Good brethren said that if these schools were suffered to live our doctrinal unity was at an end. We should soon have as many theological systems as schools. The doctrinal controversies of the Calvinistic Churches would repeat themselves in us, and perhaps rend our ecclesiastical unity. Very possibly a succession of young heretics would be trained up and foisted upon the Church, who, like the similarly trained Strausses and Channings of history, would deny the Lord who bought them, and lead away whole populations into deadly errors. What lover of the Church and of the truth could for a moment tolerate institutions of so divisive and destructive a tendency!

This kind of talk was of course very fine *ad captandum*, but, unfortunately for the opposers of our theological seminaries, their hue-and-cry only called the attention of the fair-minded, both in the ministry and among the people, to the remarkable

Especially true is all this when the theological school is located in or near such great social centers as Boston, Chicago, and New York. In a city or suburban seminary the student hears half a dozen sermons from other men to one from his own homiletical professor. He has the advantage of studying a multitude of the leading living exemplars of his profession. He can analyze them individually, and search out the secret of their respective powers. He can compare, contrast, combine, select. He can cultivate a judgment of his own, an ideal of his own, a style of his own. His individuality is far safer than it was under the old circuit training; his naturalness far better guaranteed than when he is left to his own uncriticised awkwardnesses, or to the chance models of a secluded country station. This fact having found recognition at the hands of our last General Conference, and having been officially put forth by that august body as a conclusive and satisfactory answer to the objection we are noticing, we venture to hope that this ground of opposition to our theological seminaries is at last effectually removed. To thinking men it is rather transformed into a most potent argument for the institutional training of our coming ministry.

Then there was that other bugbear. Our doctrine, our discipline, who was to guarantee that in the proposed institutions these would be preserved and inculcated in their original Methodistic purity! Good brethren said that if these schools were suffered to live our doctrinal unity was at an end. We should soon have as many theological systems as schools. The doctrinal controversies of the Calvinistic Churches would repeat themselves in us, and perhaps rend our ecclesiastical unity. Very possibly a succession of young heretics would be trained up and foisted upon the Church, who, like the similarly trained Socinuses and Channings of history, would deny the Lord who bought them, and lead away whole populations into deadly errors. What lover of the Church and of the truth could for a moment tolerate institutions of so divisive and destructive a tendency!

This kind of talk was of course very fine and convincing, but, unfortunately for the opponents of our theological seminaries, their incendiary only called the attention of the Church, both in the ministry and among the people, to the remarkable adaptation of these institutions to conserve our system of doctrine and form of discipline—to guard them from the tinkerings and tamperings of self-made innovators. It caused the fair-minded to perceive that the Church has far more to fear in this direction from ambitious and opinionated automaths than from any other source. It brought the fact into due prominence, that the teachings of our theological chairs are under far more numerous and stringent guards than are the teachings of our pulpit or press. It showed that if there is any conservative focus in the Church it is found in our theological schools. Look at the checks and guards thrown around their teachings:

1. Each is officially placed under the direct supervision of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

2. No professor can be appointed to any chair in either of the three institutions without the concurrence of the bishops.

3. In at least two of them no professor can take his chair until, in the presence of the Board of Trust, he have signed a solemn declaration, to the effect that so long as he occupies the same he will teach nothing inconsistent with the doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

4. At the Annual Conference examination of character, every professor—save one who chances to be a layman—is each year liable to arrest if even a rumor of heterodoxy is abroad against him.

5. Each institution is inspected, and its pupils annually examined as to what they have been taught, by visitors delegated from adjacent annual conferences.

6. Each has ecclesiastical qualifications affecting the appointment of trustees.

7. Each is required to report to every General Conference.

These are guarantees of Church loyalty and conservatism such as no other denomination ever exacted, and such as our own Church never threw around any other part of her machinery. If any thing can save us from doctrinal and disciplinary innovations these schools will surely do it. They are safer than any annual conference, or any group of such; safer than the Board of Bishops, or even the General Conference. Only when all these shall have proven recreant to historic Methodism will the checks and guards imposed upon our adaptation of these institutions to conserve our system of doctrine and form of discipline—to guard them from the tinkerings and temperings of self-made innovators. It caused the fair-minded to perceive that the Church has far more to fear in this direction from academies and ecclesiastical sycophants than from any other source. It brought the fact into due prominence, that the teachings of our theological chairs are under far more numerous and stringent guards than are the teachings of our pulpit or press. It showed that if there is any conservative force in the Church it is found in our theological schools. Look at the checks and guards thrown around their teachings:

1. Each is officially placed under the direct supervision of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

2. No professor can be appointed to any chair in either of the three institutions without the concurrence of the bishops.

3. In at least two of them no professor can take his chair until, in the presence of the Board of Trust, he have signed a solemn declaration, to the effect that so long as he occupies the same he will teach nothing inconsistent with the doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

4. At the Annual Conference examination of character, every professor—save one who chances to be a layman—is each year liable to arrest if even a rumor of heterodoxy is abroad against him.

5. Each institution is inspected, and its pupils annually examined as to what they have been taught, by visitors delegated from adjacent annual conferences.

6. Each has ecclesiastical qualifications affecting the appointment of trustees.

7. Each is required to report to every General Conference.

These are guarantees of Church loyalty and conservatism such as no other denomination ever exacted, and such as our own Church never threw around any other part of her machinery. If any thing can save us from doctrinal and disciplinary innovations these schools will surely do it. They are safer than any annual conferences, or any group of such; safer than the Board of Bishops, or even the General Conference. Only when all these shall have proved recreant to historic Methodism will the checks and guards imposed upon our schools for ministerial training become relaxed. This final objection to theological seminaries has, therefore, like the others, become transformed into a cogent argument for their hearty adoption. On this point, also, the last General Conference declared itself satisfied. Each demand, therefore, of our distinctive Methodistic idea of the ministerial call and office, is as fully met in the proposed re-adjustment of our system as it was in the old circuit adjustment. The training is limited to divinely-called subjects, promotes individuality of character, and secures the work of ministerial training to the Church. Indeed, in each of these vital points the new adjustment is more effective and safer than was the old. In the theological seminary, therefore, we have a remarkable providential provision against the grave and peculiar perils of our present disorganized condition. Adopting it, the Church can regain her old influence over the training of her ministry.

What now remains to be done, then, in order to secure the complete re-adjustment of our long-deranged system of ministerial education? Evidently nothing more than to adopt and perfectly incorporate the theological seminary into the established agencies of the Church; to do this so completely that this institutional instruction shall as effectually reach every candidate for the pastorate as did under the old circuit system the instruction of the elders or senior preachers. The new instruction must be made as universally available as was that for which it is substituted.

The rising public sentiment of our ministry has not yet reached this level. Thus far we have scarcely got beyond the period of active or passive opposition. Even our educators, as a body, have not got beyond the idea that theological seminaries are desirable chiefly for the purpose of training up *a sprinkling* of scholars to do a certain needed scholarly service, and save our ministry at large from the reproach of ignorance. There are, indeed, trustees and patrons of these schools who share this view. Others seem to believe that a certain small number of "upper-crust" ministers are needed, and ever will be needed, for certain "higher classes," and that, while these schools are necessary to produce a small supply of such men, the great body of our ministry would, *for their work*, be damaged rather than improved by attendance. This is the

view which, as late as April, 1867, found advocacy at the hand of as advanced a thinker and ripe a scholar as the lamented Dr. Nadal.* So long as these narrow views touching the legitimate sphere and function of the theological seminary continue to hold sway even in the educational ranks of the Church, it is useless to expect to see a universal and homogeneous system of ministerial training reinaugurated among us.

The first step, then, toward the full utilization of the theological school is a different public sentiment. The institution must not be looked upon as designed to do any partial and supplementary work. It must be seen that it does not contemplate the education of a special class of ministers either for the benefit of our literature, for the manning of our higher schools, or for the service of our first city pulpits. The Church must be made to understand that every future pastor of her flocks needs the instruction and drill of the seminary; that it is as desirable for all as for any to enjoy these advantages.

Just at this point we still encounter a mighty opposition. Comparatively few among us believe that it is even desirable to give *all* our candidates a regular course of theological training. Good brethren tell us, with all sincerity, that there are certain kinds of ministerial work for which scholarly tastes positively unfit a man; places where a preacher fresh from the people, speaking the blunt and pungent language of the uncultivated, will do an execution which the man of the schools can never attain to. Far be it from us to deny this, or to attempt to shut our eyes to it. There are, doubtless, forms of aggression upon the kingdom of Satan in which the rude eloquence of an uneducated man, himself a trophy of grace just plucked from the gutter or brothel, *will* effect results which more polished sentences from a schooled speaker could never achieve. But what does this fact suggest? Surely not that we should condemn an intelligent Christian congregation to sit fifty-two Sundays each year under the religious instruction of such a man! Surely not that we should intrust the entire administration of a religious society to him! It only suggests that the Church should employ this kind of talent in its proper field and work. It only suggests that besides its strong, intelligent, educated pastors, it should also have plain, earnest, flaming evanview which, as late as April, 1867, found advocacy at the hands of so advanced a thinker and ripe a scholar as the lamented Dr. Nadal.* So long as these narrow views touching the legitimate sphere and function of the theological seminary continue to hold sway even in the educational ranks of the Church, it is useless to expect to see a universal and homogeneous system of ministerial training inaugurated among us.

---

* *Meth. Quart. Review*, vol. xlix, pp. 221-236.

The first step, then, toward the full utilization of the theological school is a different public sentiment. The institution must not be looked upon as designed to do any partial and supplementary work. It must be seen that it does not contemplate the education of a special class of ministers either for the benefit of our literature, for the manning of our higher schools, or for the service of our first city pulpits. The Church must be made to understand that every future pastor of her flocks needs the instruction and drill of the seminary; that it is as desirable for all as for any to enjoy these advantages.

Just at this point we still encounter a mighty opposition. Comparatively few among us believe that it is even desirable to give all our candidates a regular course of theological training. Good brethren tell us, with all sincerity, that there are certain kinds of ministerial work for which scholarly tastes positively unfit a man; places where a preacher fresh from the people, speaking the blunt and pungent language of the uncultivated, will do an execution which the men of the schools can never attain to. Far be it from us to deny this, or to attempt to shut our eyes to it. There are, doubtless, fields of aggression upon the kingdom of Satan in which the rude eloquence of an uneducated man, himself a trophy of grace just plucked from the gutter or brothel, will effect results which more polished sentences from a schooled speaker could never achieve. But what does this fact suggest? Surely not that we should condemn an intelligent Christian congregation to sit fifty-two Sundays each year under the religious instruction of such a man! Surely not that we should intrust the entire administration of a religious society to him! It only suggests that the Church should employ this kind of talent in its proper field of work. It only suggests that besides its strong, intelligent, educated pastors, it should also have plain, earnest, flaming evangelists, home missionaries, lay preachers, who, unburdened by the care of local flocks, yet under proper oversight, can carry the war into the enemy's country. This our Church has always seen and acted upon. All we need to do is to rightly discriminate between the work of the pastor and that of the lay preacher. There is no part of the proper work of the former for which one will not be better qualified if he can attend our theological seminaries. Whatever work an unschooled man can do better than a schooled one either lies too remote from his local duties as pastor for him to engage in at all, or, if otherwise, can best be done *through* his lay preachers as his assistants. In fine, while the unschooled man has, outside the pastorate, the fullest liberty and opportunity to do whatever he can do better than he could if educated, there is nothing in the pastoral sphere which he can do so well. Our conclusion, therefore, is, that while a systematic course of theological instruction and drill under appointed teachers may neither be necessary nor desirable for our local ministry, it is, on the other hand, for our future pastors not only eminently desirable, but even essential to highest success. To this conclusion the controlling minds of the Church will yet come. To it they are already rapidly coming.

---

* Meth. Quart. Review, vol. xlix, pp. 321-324.

Now the moment general public sentiment among us can be brought to this point the main difficulty in the way of the reconstruction of our lost system of ministerial training will be surmounted. Once let a living conviction pervade the Church that it is desirable, eminently desirable, to furnish all our future pastors with the privileges of systematic training, and it will be found practicable. The will will find a way. The precise measures which may be found wise and needful cannot of course be definitely predicted at present, but they will in all probability include changes something like the following:

1. A modification of the disciplinary course of study, approximating it more nearly to a complete seminary curriculum, yet at the same time, by a system of judicious "substitutes" for Hebrew and Greek, making provision for such men as the Conference by direct vote may excuse from attending the schools.

2. A ministerial education society in every Conference, auxiliary to the Church board of education, or to a branch

gelists, home missionaries, lay preachers, who, unburdened by the care of local flocks, yet under proper oversight, can carry the war into the enemy's country. This our Church has always seen and acted upon. All we need to do is to rigidly discriminate between the work of the pastor and that of the lay preacher. There is no part of the proper work of the former for which one will not be better qualified if he can attend our theological seminaries. Whatever work an unschooled man can do better than a schooled one either lies too remote from his local duties as pastor for him to engage in at all, or, if otherwise, can best be done *through* his lay preachers as his assistants. In fine, while the unschooled man has, outside the pastorate, the fullest liberty and opportunity to do whatever he can do better than he could if educated, there is nothing in the pastoral sphere which he can do so well. Our conclusion, therefore, is, that while a systematic course of theological instruction and drill under appointed teachers may neither be necessary nor desirable for our local ministry, it is, on the other hand, for our future pastors not only eminently desirable, but even essential to highest success. To this conclusion the controlling minds of the Church will yet come. Yea, if they are already rapidly coming.

Now the moment general public sentiment among us can be brought to this point the main difficulty in the way of the reconstruction of our lost system of ministerial training will be surmounted. Once let a living conviction pervade the Church that it is desirable, eminently desirable, to furnish all our future pastors with the privileges of systematic training, and it will be found practicable. The will will find a way. The precise measures which may be found wise and needful cannot of course be definitely predicted at present, but they will in all probability include changes something like the following:

1. A modification of the disciplinary course of study, approximating it more nearly to a complete seminary curriculum, yet at the same time, by a system of judicious "substitutions" for Hebrew and Greek, making provision for such men as the Conference by direct vote may excuse from attending the schools.

2. A ministerial education society in every Conference, auxiliary to the Church board of education, or to a branch

of the same, receiving an annual collection from every charge.

3. The instruction of the committee on education in each Conference to keep a list of all local preachers and exhorters belonging within the bounds of the Conference, to specially look after those who are avowedly preparing for Conference service, and to recommend to the patronage of the Conference education society such of the same as may be poor and worthy. Connected with this should be a requirement that the Conference education society annually report to the Conference upon the character and proficiency of each beneficiary accepted on the above recommendation.

4. The authorization of our bishops to appoint Conference probationers and members to our theological schools for purpose of study, the time there spent after such appointment counting toward their qualification for orders, the same as if spent upon a circuit or station.*

5. The recognition of our authorized theological schools as co-ordinate branches of one great Church agency, and the requirement of each to report its condition and work annually, not to a handful of adjacent, so-called "patronizing," Conferences, but to all the Annual Conferences of the land.

Given a public sentiment in the Church demanding that, as a general rule, all those of our ministers who propose to become pastors shall be systematically instructed and trained for their work, and the above slight modifications would be sufficient to meet the new emergency. The machinery is all complete, it only needs one movement of the adjustment-bar to throw it into gear, and every wheel and cylinder and eccentric will again revolve as smoothly and beautifully and efficiently as in the best days of our Methodist fathers. That movement of the adjustment-bar, however, must come from a heightened and intensified public sentiment.

In the foregoing pages we have endeavored to do three things:

First. To exhibit the distinctive excellences of our original Methodistic system of ministerial training.

Second. To show how, in consequence of the abandonment of the old circuit arrangement, that system of ministerial training of the same, receiving an annual collection from every charge.

---

* This just provision has long existed in the Wesleyan Connection.

3. The instruction of the committee on education in each Conference to keep a list of all local preachers and exhorters belonging within the bounds of the Conference, to specially look after those who are avowedly preparing for Conference service, and to recommend to the patronage of the Conference education society such of the same as may be poor and worthy. Connected with this should be a requirement that the Conference education society annually report to the Conference upon the character and proficiency of each beneficiary accepted on the above recommendation.

4. The authorization of our bishops to appoint Conference probationers and members to our theological schools for purpose of study, the time there spent after such appointment counting toward their qualification for orders, the same as if spent upon a circuit or station.*

5. The recognition of our authorized theological schools as co-ordinate branches of one great Church agency, and the requirement of each to report its condition and work annually, not to a handful of adjacent, so-called "patronizing," Conferences, but to all the Annual Conferences of the land.

Given a public sentiment in the Church demanding that, as a general rule, all those of our ministers who propose to become pastors shall be systematically instructed and trained for their work, and the above slight modifications would be sufficient to meet the new emergency. The machinery is all complete, it only needs one movement of the adjustment-bar to throw it into gear, and every wheel and cylinder and eccentric will again revolve as smoothly and beautifully and efficiently as in the best days of our Methodist fathers. That movement of the adjustment-bar, however, must come from a heightened and intensified public sentiment.

In the foregoing pages we have endeavored to do three things:

First. To exhibit the distinctive excellences of our original Methodistic system of ministerial training.

Second. To show how, in consequence of the abandonment of the old circuit arrangement, that system of ministerial training was completely crippled, and mere self-culture substituted for it.

---

* This just provision has long existed in the Wesleyan Connection.

Third. To point out the new educational agency which God has provided in place of the old, and the ease with which the Church may resume the work of actively training her ministry.

The reader's already tested patience will not allow us to sketch a picture of the trials and difficulties and discouragements encountered by every young minister sent out under our present system to a lonely charge, there, without counsel, instruction, experience, or even books, to learn for himself—chiefly from his own mortifying and often soul-endangering blunders—how to be a successful minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. We may not point to the many who, thus abandoned to their own immature judgment, have fallen first into natural imprudences, then into follies and sins which shipwrecked their character and brought lasting reproach upon the cause of Christ. We may not pause to name men—some of them of high secular scholarship—who, stinging with mortification over failures, from which a proper ministerial training would have saved them, have fled their station and turned their backs forever upon the ministry. We have no space to tell the sad story of Churches founded and made strong by wise master-builders, but left to dwindle away under the weak platitudes of men whose "education" has been acquired chiefly in the society of gossips, or in the loafing-places of fast young men. Would we might speak of the hunger—the veritable *hunger*—of our people for a more substantial spiritual diet—might show that, however it may be with prodigies, the rank and file of our ministry will never become thorough Bible scholars, wise pastors, simple yet fresh and durable preachers, controlling powers in their respective communities, model characters for the imitation of the flock, without further and more direct training than the Church now requires. All such thoughts must be omitted here.

In conclusion, it may be needful to add three words to preclude a possible misconception or perversion of the positions of this paper. And, first, the writer cannot permit any thing in it to be construed as implying any desire on his part to see collegiate or even theological seminary education made a prerequisite condition of Conference membership or even of

pastoral trusts. While he firmly believes each of these preparations to be eminently desirable for all pastors, he has no desire, in the existing state of public sentiment, to see any Conference law requiring either. While believing the time is coming when, in our old and settled Conferences such preparation will be the general rule, he also believes that it would inflict an irreparable damage upon the work of God to force the measure now, or at any time, by mere authority. It will come of itself as soon as the Church is ripe for it. All we desire in this direction is that legislation keep pace with the progress of public sentiment in the Church.

Secondly, no expressions in this paper must be understood as an arraignment of our Church, as a whole, for general recreancy to duty with respect to education. Individuals may have been recreant—high-placed officials even—but the Church never. A large proportion of our ministry and laity have had a holy mania on this subject. No other Church similarly situated has ever done half so much. Considering her origin and providential work in other directions, she has wrought miracles in this. Her past guarantees her future. With respect to her educational destiny we have not the slightest anxiety. Of such a Church, in such a field, with such a record, one may confidently take up the ancient credo,

Non potest deficere ecclesia.*

Finally, the writer cannot allow any thing in these pages to be tortured into an unfriendly reflection upon those who, favored neither with the instruction of elder brethren, as were the fathers, nor yet with the advantages of the schools, as are the sons, have bravely accepted the hard condition, and, in spite of all obstacles, for Jesus's sake, fought their way single-handed up to character, learning, and success. For such men we have profoundest veneration. We respect them pastoral trusts. While he firmly believes each of these preparations to be eminently desirable for all pastors, he has no desire, in the existing state of public sentiment, to see any Conference law requiring either. While believing the time is coming when, in our old and settled Conferences such preparation will be the general rule, he also believes that it would inflict an irreparable damage upon the work of God to force the measure now, or at any time, by mere authority. It will come of itself as soon as the Church is ripe for it. All we desire in this direction is that legislation keep pace with the progress of public sentiment in the Church.

---

* Noteworthy and just is the following tribute to the relative forwardness of our laity in this department: "It is a significant fact, that as soon as a number of eminent laymen came into council on the subject, there was a very hearty concurrence in the policy of establishing schools of Christian learning for the educating of our future ministry. On this subject we ever believed that our people were quite abreast with, if not ahead of, our ministry. Our hearers were not much better satisfied with our extant preaching than the preachers themselves."—DR. WHEDON, *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1871.

Secondly, no expressions in this paper must be understood as an arraignment of our Church, as a whole, for general recreancy to duty with respect to education. Individuals may have been recreant—high-placed officials even—but the Church never. A large proportion of our ministry and laity have had a holy mania on this subject. No other Church similarly situated has ever done half so much. Considering her origin and providential work in other directions, she has wrought miracles in this. Her past guarantees her future. With respect to her educational destiny we have not the slightest anxiety. Of such a Church, in such a field, with such a record, one may confidently take up the ancient creed,

Esse potest deficere nescia.*

Finally, the writer cannot allow any thing in these pages to be tortured into an unfriendly reflection upon those who, favored neither with the instruction of elder brethren, as were the fathers, nor yet with the advantages of the schools, as are the sons, have bravely accepted the hard condition, and, in spite of all obstacles, for Jesus's sake, fought their way single-handed up to character, learning, and success. For such men we have profoundest veneration. We respect them far more highly than we can the man who, with all the advantages of early scholastic training, no more than comes up to their level. Before many of them we bow with a sense of unworthiness to so much as even loose their shoe-latchet. Nor is this feeling limited to those who, in consequence of uncommon natural endowments, have achieved a distinction whose height renders every question as to place or mode of education an impertinence; it is felt toward scores of unknown men who have never thought or dreamed of greatness save in humility and in sweet sacrifice of self for Christ. Whoever has *done his best* has done more than the most favored scholar will claim for himself, and more than ordinarily can be claimed for him. These men deserve our admiration, not only for what they have done, but specially for their unselfish desires that those who are to come after them may have privileges which were denied to them. Not the sons of wealth and fortune, not those who in scholastic privilege have had all that heart could wish—not these are the men who most earnestly plead for better educational facilities for our ministers. No; it is that other class who have all their lives hungered to know things which they could not, those who for every thing they ever did learn paid in time and labor three times as much as it would have cost them had they but enjoyed a proper training in their youth. These are the men who say that those who come after them must not be left to struggle as they have struggled, and sorrow as they have sorrowed. These, far more than our so-called educated men, are the ones whose prayer and yearning we have voiced above. These, with greater emphasis than any others, are to-day begging the Church to re-adjust her broken machinery, and again take up the direct training of her sons. Such men are not to beg in vain.

---

* Noteworthy and just is the following tribute to the relative forwardness of our laity in this department: "It is a significant fact, that as soon as a number of eminent laymen came into counsel on the subject, there was a very decided preference in the policy of establishing schools of Christian learning for the education of our future ministry. On this subject we have believed that our people were quite abreast with, if not ahead of, our ministry. Our people were not much better satisfied with our unlettered preaching than the preachers themselves."—Dr. Warren, *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1871.

far more highly than we can the man who, with all the advantages of early scholastic training, no more than comes up to their level. Before many of them we bow with a sense of unworthiness to so much as even loose their shoe-latchet. Nor is this feeling limited to those who, in consequence of uncommon natural endowments, have achieved a distinction whose height renders every question as to place or mode of education an impertinence; it is felt toward scores of unknown men who have never thought or dreamed of greatness save in humility and in sweet sacrifice of self for Christ. Whoever has done *his best* has done more than the most favored scholar will claim for himself, and more than ordinarily can be claimed for him. These men deserve our admiration, not only for what they have done, but specially for their unselfish desires that those who are to come after them may have privileges which were denied to them. Not the sons of wealth and fortune, not those who in scholastic privilege have had all that heart could wish—not these are the men who most earnestly plead for better educational facilities for our ministers. No; it is that other class who have all their lives hungered to know things which they could not, those who for every thing they ever did learn paid in time and labor three times as much as it would have cost them had they but enjoyed a proper training in their youth. These are the men who say that those who come after them must not be left to struggle as they have struggled, and sorrow as they have sorrowed. These, far more than our so-called educated men, are the ones whose prayer and yearning we have voiced above. These, with greater emphasis than any others, are to-day begging the Church to re-adjust her broken machinery, and again take up the direct training of her sons. Such men are not to beg in vain.

ART. VI.—CHURCH EXTENSION.

SUNDRY ANNUAL REPORTS

Of the Church Extension Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
Of the Wesleyan Chapel Committee, Manchester, England.
Of the Metropolitan Chapel Building Fund, London, England.
Of the Trustees of the Church Erection Fund of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New York.
Of the Trustees of the American Congregational Union, New York.
Of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, New York.

THE literature of Church Extension is confined to the Reports of the various societies, committees, and boards engaged in this department of Christian work. One may search in vain through our cyclopedias—even "biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical"—no article on "Church Extension" can be found. Abundant information on Missions, Sunday-schools, Bible Societies, Tract Societies, Churches, Church Architecture, Church Edifices, etc., is easily accessible; but if you want to know any thing about Church Extension you must go to the Reports. Surely, our encyclopedists must share the too common opinion that no good thing can come out of these literary Nazareths. We can only say to them, "Come and see." They contain much more valuable information, for this intensely practical age, than is generally supposed. But as they are annual reports, giving in each case information simply of the year's work, it is no easy task to gather from the few that can be collected a clear view of the organization, history, and plans of this department of work in the various Churches. It would be a great convenience if one could find such information where he has a right to expect it—in works that profess to collect and condense information on all subjects, under suggestive words.

It will be no defense to say that the subject is too modern to claim a place in literature. Some of the Churches have been engaged in this department for years before some of our new cyclopedias were projected—one at least for more than half a century. The best thing to be done is to correct the oversight in the next edition, and if the Reports placed at the head of this article, and others similar, shall lead some one accustomed to historical research to bring this to pass, a valuable service will have been rendered.

Art. VI.—CHURCH EXTENSION.

Several Annual Reports.

Of the Church Extension Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
Of the Wesleyan Chapel Committee, Manchester, England.
Of the Metropolitan Chapel Building Fund, London, England.
Of the Trustees of the Church Erection Fund of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New York.
Of the Trustees of the American Congregational Union, New York.
Of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, New York.

The literature of Church Extension is confined to the Reports of the various societies, committees, and boards engaged in this department of Christian work. One may search in vain through our cyclopedias—even "biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical"—no article on "Church Extension" can be found. Abundant information on Missions, Sunday-schools, Bible Societies, Tract Societies, Churches, Church Architecture, Church Edifices, etc., is easily accessible; but if you want to know any thing about Church Extension you must go to the Reports. Surely, our encyclopedists must share the too common opinion that no good thing can come out of these literary Nazareths. We can only say to them, "Come and see." They contain much more valuable information, for this intensely practical age, than is generally supposed. But as they are annual reports, giving in each case information simply of the year's work, it is no easy task to gather from the few that can be collected a clear view of the organization, history, and plans of this department of work in the various Churches. It would be a great convenience if one could find such information where he has a right to expect it—in works that profess to collect and condense information on all subjects, under suggestive words.

It will be no defense to say that the subject is too modern to claim a place in literature. Some of the Churches have been engaged in this department for years before some of our now cyclopedias were projected—one at least for more than half a century. The best thing to be done is to correct the oversight in the next edition, and if the Reports placed at the head of this article, and others similar, shall lead some one more accustomed to historical research to bring this to pass, a valuable service will have been rendered.

That a healthy church-life should take upon itself organized forms of church-work as the progress of events requires, is as natural as that an acorn should develop an oak. It inheres in the very nature of church-life, and the only escape from the law is in spiritual and ecclesiastical death. This is the order of God, and it has been abundantly illustrated in history.

To the Church was committed the "oracles of God"—his revealed will to man—not to be chained within gloomy walls, and its divine light strained out of darkness, through the minds of men who know not God, upon the souls of the multitudes groping in outer darkness, but in trust for the world, to be preserved in purity, translated into all languages, and transmitted to all peoples. It was God's purpose that every child of man should have it in his own tongue, and he has incorporated into the very life of the Church the vital force that through the printing press, given centuries after the word, is now, according to his original purpose, working out the glorious result. Given, a living Church, the word in trust, and the printing-press, and the organized form of church-work found in our Bible societies is as certain as destiny. It is one of the Divine decrees.

Christ said to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Were these words spoken for their ears alone? They could not obey them fully. Had they been immediately "scattered abroad," and gone everywhere preaching the word, they could not have gone "into *all* the world" nor preached "the Gospel to every creature." They could not to the men of their own time, and of course could not to the generations yet to come. These potent words, like the promise of the Holy Ghost, were for them and for their children—for the Church that then was, and that now is, and that is to come. Christ stereotyped the missionary formulary in the great commission, and it comes to us as it did to them; and the Holy Ghost puts the missionary spirit into the church-life, and it throbs and thrills in that life, and will until the whole world shall be brought to God. The command is "Go;" and the life-impulse is "Go," and the result is organized going—the Church *as a body* obeying the command of its Master and Head, and the impulse of its life, and *going into all the world* and preaching the Gospel *to every creature.*

But the preaching of the Gospel in the ears of men was not the *end.* It was but a means to the end. The thing to be done was to "disciple" all nations; to "baptize them" into the Church; to make them a part of it. The apostles were to preach, but the preaching was to be "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"—"the power of God unto salvation"—and the "saved" were to be added to the Church, the organized body of Christians. It was not enough that the offer of life should be made; men must be made to live, and every one born into this new life must be a means of life to others on beyond him. In the economy of the Gospel, as in the economy of nature, no element of power is to be wasted, but all utilized and made subservient to the final purpose. All increase of the Church is to be assimilated as in a living body, and that not merely to supply the waste incident to living, as in a mature or declining body, but, as in a young life, to bring increase of vitality and working power for Christ's Church, which never grows old.

It is in the wise observance of this law that the word of God is "to increase mightily and prevail," and every department of church-work should be wisely adjusted thereto. The ultimate victory imperatively requires that the Church should constantly advance to new positions, and that each new position gained should immediately be fortified and firmly held, and made the base for further advances, and that the lines of communication should be always open from the center to the most distant outpost. That Church that settles down in a spirit of conservatism—simply to take care of what it has—should be granted a superannuated relation to the on-moving host. When it shall get its present membership safely to heaven its work will be done. It has lost sight of the fundamental principles of its charter and of the end of its being, and the sooner the world can be delivered from the influence of its example of dignified idleness the better for the cause it has ceased to serve.

A clearer recognition of the true principles and purpose of church-organization, and of the fundamental laws of successful church-work, is developing in most Protestant denominations agencies of increased efficiency; or, more accurately, perhaps, the inner and essential life of the Church is pressing out into organized forms of work, as determined by the laws of its life and the necessities into which it grows.

But the preaching of the Gospel in the case of men was not the end. It was but a means to the end. The thing to be done was to "disciple" all nations; to "baptize them" into the Church; to make them a part of it. The apostles were to preach, but the preaching was to be "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"—"the power of God unto salvation"—and the "saved" were to be added to the Church, the organized body of Christians. It was not enough that the offer of life should be made; men must be made to live, and every one born into this new life must be a means of life to others on beyond him. In the economy of the Gospel, as in the economy of nature, no element of power is to be wasted, but all utilized and made subservient to the final purpose. All increase of the Church is to be assimilated as in a living body, and that not merely to supply the waste incident to living, as in a mature or declining body, but, as in a young life, to bring increase of vitality and working power for Christ's Church, which never grows old.

It is in the wise observance of this law that the word of God is "to increase mightily and prevail," and every department of church-work should be wisely adjusted thereto. The ultimate victory imperatively requires that the Church should constantly advance to new positions, and that each new position gained should immediately be fortified and firmly held, and made the base for further advances, and that the lines of communication should be always open from the center to the most distant outpost. That Church that settles down in a spirit of conservatism—simply to take care of what it has—should be granted a superannuated relation to the on-moving host. When it shall get its present membership safely to heaven its work will be done. It has lost sight of the fundamental principles of its charter and of the end of its being, and the sooner the world can be delivered from the influence of its example of dignified idleness the better for the cause it has ceased to serve.

A clearer recognition of the true principles and purpose of church-organization, and of the fundamental laws of successful church-work, is developing in most Protestant denominations agencies of increased efficiency; or, more accurately, perhaps, the inner and essential life of the Church is pressing out into organized forms of work, as determined by the laws of its life and the necessities into which it grows.

The most striking example of this is found in the department of Church Extension, as seen among the Wesleyans and others of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists of this country.

CHURCH EXTENSION AMONG THE WESLEYANS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The Wesleyans of England seem to have been the pioneers in this, as a separate department of work. Many of their chapels had been erected when their people were able to contribute only a small part of their cost; but out of their poverty they could put in enough to make the property security for the balance needed, and could then borrow the remainder. In this way large debts were accumulated, and in many cases the trustees found themselves unable to provide even for the accruing interest. Of course they were at once involved in serious trouble, and were constrained to seek aid from the stronger. The evil soon grew to such magnitude that it arrested the attention of the Conference and the whole denomination. The extent to which the trust property of the denomination was, on inquiry, found to be involved, occasioned general anxiety and alarm. The danger of losing much of what they had, seriously checked the work of acquiring more. They were made to feel that every department of Church interest and work suffered with this. The household could be neither happy nor prosperous with the sheriff's hammer hanging over the homestead; and the homeless lost hope of home when they saw that it could only be had with hard struggle and this peril of loss.

Some of the best minds of the denomination were given to the solution of the problem. The relief of the embarrassed chapels was seen to be the work of years; and beyond was the work of aiding the weak and destitute, so long as the Church should be true to its mission of preaching the Gospel to the poor and discipling the nations of the earth. The result was the organization of the Chapel Fund Committee in the year 1818. Special appeals in behalf of distressed chapels were to be at once discontinued, and annual collections throughout the connection were to be taken and put into the hands of a committee composed of ministers and laymen, who were charged with the duty of investigating each application with care, and

The most striking example of this is found in the department of Church Extension, as seen among the Wesleyans and others of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists of this country.

Church Extension among the Wesleyans of Great Britain.

The Wesleyans of England seem to have been the pioneers in this, as a separate department of work. Many of their chapels had been erected when their people were able to contribute only a small part of their cost; but out of their poverty they could put in enough to make the property security for the balance needed, and could then borrow the remainder. In this way large debts were accumulated, and in many cases the trustees found themselves unable to provide even for the accruing interest. Of course they were at once involved in serious trouble, and were constrained to seek aid from the stronger. The evil soon grew to such magnitude that it arrested the attention of the Conference and the whole denomination. The extent to which the trust property of the denomination was, on inquiry, found to be involved, occasioned general anxiety and alarm. The danger of losing much of what they had, seriously checked the work of acquiring more. They were made to feel that every department of Church interest and work suffered with this. The household could be neither happy nor prosperous with the sheriff's hammer hanging over the homestead; and the homeless lost hope of home when they saw that it could only be had with hard struggle and this peril of loss.

Some of the best minds of the denomination were given to the solution of the problem. The relief of the embarrassed chapels was seen to be the work of years; and beyond was the work of aiding the weak and destitute, so long as the Church should be true to its mission of preaching the Gospel to the poor and discipling the nations of the earth. The result was the organization of the Chapel Fund Committee in the year 1818. Special appeals in behalf of distressed chapels were to be at once discontinued, and annual collections throughout the connection were to be taken and put into the hands of a committee composed of ministers and laymen, who were charged with the duty of investigating each application with care, and distributing the funds placed in their hands as the circumstances of each might require.

The Report of 1851 states:

> When first established, in 1818, it was designed to obviate the great inconvenience and expense of ministers leaving their circuits to beg for particular chapels. This evil was at once removed, and by one general collection all private applications were superseded and abolished, and, by all circuits contributing a little, the whole of these distressed chapels were gradually relieved. But it was proposed and hoped that help would soon be given *toward the erection of chapels* in the smaller and poorer circuits. This important object is as desirable as ever, but seems to be far distant. Yet an immense improvement has taken place in the management of our chapel affairs.

The Report of 1852 contains the following epitome of the work of the Committee:

> From the period of the establishment of the fund until 1823—five years—the annual income was distributed chiefly in meeting ordinary deficiencies. [That is, on interest that trustees were unable to pay.] In 1823 the Committee first applied the income to the reduction of principal. In 1827 a small loan was taken up and repaid out of the yearly income, and in 1829 a second in the same way. In 1832 a new loan of nearly two hundred thousand dollars was taken up, and repaid, with interest, by yearly installments, in about thirteen years.

In 1845 an "experiment" was tried not wholly unlike that which some would urge upon us now in this country. It consisted in uniting the Chapel and Educational Funds for the ensuing seven years. It was supposed that their natures were so kindred that their alliance was most natural, and that their united claims would procure a considerable increase of receipts, and that the moiety would suffice for each. But the result proved that the two united received less than the Chapel Fund alone had during the preceding seven years. Both causes suffered immensely from the experiment, and thenceforward each has had a separate management, to the great advantage of both, and no advocate of consolidation can be found.

In 1855, the whole system having become somewhat complicated, was, pursuant to the order of the Conference of the preceding year, revised and simplified. The Report for that year says:

> The various Committees to whom the oversight and management of chapel affairs had previously been intrusted have been amalga-

distributing the funds placed in their hands as the circumstances of each might require.

The Report of 1851 states:

When first established, in 1818, it was designed to obviate the great inconvenience and expense of ministers leaving their circuits to beg for particular chapels. This evil was at once removed, and by one general collection all private applications were superseded and abolished, and, by all circuits contributing a little, the whole of these distressed chapels were gradually relieved. But it was proposed and hoped that help would soon be given toward the erection of chapels in the smaller and poorer circuits. This important object is as desirable as ever, but seems to be far distant. Yet an immense improvement has taken place in the management of our chapel affairs.

The Report of 1853 contains the following epitome of the work of the Committee:

From the period of the establishment of the fund until 1825—five years—the annual income was distributed chiefly in meeting ordinary deficiencies. [That is, an interest that trustees were unable to pay.] In 1825 the Committee first applied the income to the reduction of principal. In 1827 a small loan was taken up and repaid out of the yearly income, and in 1829 a second in the same way. In 1832 a new loan of nearly two hundred thousand dollars was taken up, and repaid, with interest, by yearly installments, in about thirteen years.

In 1845 an "experiment" was tried not wholly unlike that which some would urge upon us now in this country. It consisted in uniting the Chapel and Educational Funds for the ensuing seven years. It was supposed that their natures were so kindred that their alliance was most natural, and that their united claims would procure a considerable increase of receipts, and that the moiety would suffice for each. But the result proved that the two united received less than the Chapel Fund alone had during the preceding seven years. Both causes suffered immensely from the experiment, and thenceforward each has had a separate management, to the great advantage of both, and no advocate of consolidation can be found.

In 1855, the whole system having become somewhat complicated, was, pursuant to the order of the Conference of the preceding year, revised and simplified. The Report for that year says:

The various Committees to whom the oversight and management of chapel affairs had previously been intrusted have been amalgamated into one united Committee, which in all public documents should be uniformly designated as the "WESLEYAN CHAPEL COMMITTEE." . . . The Building Committee, the Relief Committee, and the Distribution Committee, as such, no longer exist; the important functions formerly exercised by such Committees separately being now merged in the one united Committee just named, on whom, also, an entirely new class of duties has been devolved in the disposal, on the principle of *loan*, of the money received from the Connectional Relief and Extension Fund.

The Committee as now constituted consists of thirty ministers and thirty laymen, appointed annually by the Conference, including the president and secretary of the Conference, the ex-president, and the treasurers and secretaries of the Chapel Fund, who are the executive officers of the Committee. Its regular meetings are held monthly. Its duties are various. The regulations say:

> It shall determine all erections, enlargements, purchases, and sales of trust property, and on the erection of organs; shall dispose of all loans and grants; and, when requested, may afford advice on difficult cases.

The funds are raised by public collections made yearly in every chapel, subscriptions from the Trust Funds of the various chapels, and from individuals and by personal donations and legacies.

The disbursements are made with great care. Applications must contain full information of all essential facts, and must be approved by a district committee, upon whom the duty of careful inquiry is devolved.

The details of the whole work are carefully defined in rules and regulations, some of which would seem to us in this country very minute, and others very exacting. For example:

> No application for relief shall be recommended by a district committee unless the trustees make anniversary collections in aid of the funds, or show sufficient cause to the contrary; nor until they engage to contribute an annual subscription from their trust estate to the Chapel Fund, the amount to be agreed upon with the Committee.

Rather exacting; but who shall say that the principle is not right? Those receiving aid should surely be willing to aid others.

The work of the Committee is carefully reviewed every year

by a committee designated for the purpose, and a full report is made to the Conference.

From the period of the reorganization of the Committee, in 1855, the ordinary income for chapel purposes has steadily increased from $19,425 in that year to $40,000 for the year 1871.

In every respect the work of the Committee has been of great importance and value to Wesleyan Methodism. It has relieved distressed chapels throughout the kingdom; has secured a better tenure of trust property; has imparted a new impetus to chapel building, directed it more wisely, and has elevated the standard of architecture with reference to both convenience and beauty. It has rendered a like service for denominational schools and "ministers' houses." It is to-day the most important agency for the promotion of Wesleyan Methodism within the kingdom.

The whole system of chapel building being under the general supervision of the Committee, its reports contain the statistics complete.

For the year 1871, 136 new chapels were sanctioned, estimated to cost $710,955, being an average of over $5,200 per chapel. Of these, sixty-four were to supplant old ones, and seventy-two were to be in new localities. Including a few enlargements of old chapels, the number of sittings to be added was 23,173. The total cost of all erections, enlargements, etc., was estimated at $1,148,830. These statistics for a single year—and they are about the present average per annum—may serve to indicate the importance and value of this work in England.

This same department of work was instituted in Ireland in 1820—only two years after its origin in England—and more recently it has been extended into Wales and Scotland. In Ireland a committee from the Conference was appointed to confer with a committee of laymen, and "devise the best means for liquidating existing chapel debts, and aiding in the erection of new chapels." The result was an arrangement so similar to that in England, and a subsequent work so like it in its relations to Irish Methodism, though of course on a much smaller scale, that no extended notice of it is here necessary.

A much more important movement in this department of service was the institution of the "METROPOLITAN WESLEYAN

CHAPEL BUILDING FUND" in the early part of 1861. It originated in a meeting of a few friends held in the house of Rev. William Arthur. It was afterward publicly and formally founded at a meeting held in Centenary Hall, April 17, 1861. At these two meetings subscriptions and donations were made to the amount of nearly $80,000. This meeting was followed by others, at which the subscriptions were somewhat enlarged and the plans more definitely formed. The objects of the fund were stated as follows:

1. To promote the erection of commodious chapels in suitable situations in and around the metropolis.
2. To assist in the enlargement of existing chapels, but only in those cases where, by the alteration, they are made equally capacious with the new chapels aided by this fund.
3. To secure eligible sites, especially in new localities, with the co-operation of the circuits in which they may be situated.

It was no part of the purpose to aid in the payment of old chapel debts, but to institute an aggressive agency. It was proposed to raise immediately a capital of at least $100,000, and then to add to it by annual subscriptions, donations, and legacies and contributions from chapel trusts, especially from those aided by the fund.

One half of the original amount secured, and of all additions thereto, was to be used by loans without interest, and the other half by donations as occasion should require. All applications for aid from the fund were required to be approved by the Connectional Committee, in accordance with the usual forms.

It was provided that the fund should be administered by a committee consisting of the president and secretary of the Conference, a chairman, two secretaries and two treasurers, the superintendents of the London and Deptford circuit, and two laymen, subscribers to the fund, from each circuit.

At the first ensuing session of the Conference the "scheme was cordially approved, with the understanding that every erection proposed shall, according to existing rules and usages, pass through the quarterly and district meetings, and receive the sanction of the Chapel Committee."

One of the first things done was to prepare a map of the city, showing the location of every Methodist chapel. They were

CHAPEL BUILDING FUND" in the early part of 1861. It originated in a meeting of a few friends held in the house of Rev. William Arthur. It was afterward publicly and formally founded at a meeting held in Centenary Hall, April 11, 1861. At these two meetings subscriptions and donations were made to the amount of nearly £50,000. This meeting was followed by others, at which the subscriptions were somewhat enlarged and the plans more definitely formed. The objects of the fund were stated as follows:

1. To promote the erection of commodious chapels in suitable situations in and around the metropolis.
2. To assist in the enlargement of existing chapels, but only in those cases where, by the alteration, they are made equally capacious with the new chapels aided by this fund.
3. To secure eligible sites, especially in new localities, with the co-operation of the circuits in which they may be situated.

It was no part of the purpose to aid in the payment of old chapel debts, but to institute an aggressive agency. It was proposed to raise immediately a capital of at least £100,000, and then to add to it by annual subscriptions, donations, and legacies and contributions from chapel trusts, especially from those aided by the fund.

One half of the original amount secured, and of all additions thereto, was to be paid by loans without interest, and the other half by donations as occasion should require. All applications for aid from the fund were required to be approved by the Connectional Committee, in accordance with the usual forms.

It was provided that the fund should be administered by a committee consisting of the president and secretary of the Conference, a chairman, two secretaries and two treasurers, the superintendents of the London and Deptford circuits, and two laymen, subscribers to the fund, from each circuit.

At the first evening session of the Conference the "scheme was cordially approved, with the understanding that every erection proposed shall, according to existing rules and usages, pass through the quarterly and district meetings, and receive the sanction of the Chapel Committee."

One of the first things done was to prepare a map of the city, showing the location of every Methodist chapel. They were found to be in clusters, while whole sections of the city, with vast populations, were without any. Some of these were estimated to contain seventy thousand souls. Nowhere else among the English-speaking population of the British possessions, from Newfoundland to New Zealand, could ten thousand souls be found without a Methodist chapel; but here, in the heart of the British metropolis, were sevenfold that number with neither Methodist chapel nor school. It was estimated that not more than four per cent. of the population could find sittings in Methodist chapels. The facts were startling, yet more than three years passed away before the first $100,000 were secured. But the Committee did not wait. Early in 1862 the first appropriations were made, and within the next two years five large new chapels and two valuable school chapels were opened in destitute parts of the city. Others soon followed, and the value of the movement was soon apparent to all. During the eleven years that this fund has been in operation Methodism has accomplished more in London than during the preceding half century. It has secured better locations, and built more chapels, of better style, under this organized management than in five times the period without it.

Within the last year the work has received a fresh impetus. At the organization eleven years ago, the largest single subscription was $15,000. It was a noble generosity. But a year ago Sir Francis Lycett offered to give a quarter of a million of dollars, on condition that a like sum should be added, making half a million of dollars, to secure the erection of fifty new chapels. More than four fifths of the amount required has been secured, and several of the new chapels are now in process of erection. This will mark a new era in the history of London Methodism; and thousands of the neglected poor, and their children after them, will fill these fifty chapels with grateful praise for the wise liberality that provided them. Other independent Churches in England are engaged in similar work; but we come now to the Churches of our own country.

CHURCH EXTENSION AMONG THE PRESBYTERIANS.

The Presbyterians seem to have been the pioneers in this branch of church-work in the United States. It was at first instituted as a department of home missionary labor among the found to be in clusters, while whole sections of the city, with vast populations, were without any. Some of these were estimated to contain seventy thousand souls. Nowhere else among the English-speaking population of the British possessions, from Newfoundland to New Zealand, could ten thousand souls be found without a Methodist chapel; but here, in the heart of the British metropolis, were sevenfold that number with neither Methodist chapel nor school. It was estimated that not more than four per cent. of the population could find sittings in Methodist chapels. The facts were startling, yet more than three years passed away before the first $100,000 was secured. But the Committee did not wait. Early in 18 the first appropriations were made, and within the next two years five large new chapels and two valuable school chapels were opened in destitute parts of the city. Others soon followed, and the value of the movement was soon apparent to all. During the eleven years that this fund has been in operation Methodism has accomplished more in London than during the preceding half century. It has secured better locations, and built more chapels, of better style, under this organized management than in five times the period without it.

Within the last year the work has received a fresh impetus. At the organization eleven years ago, the largest single subscription was $12,500. It was a noble generosity. But a year ago Sir Francis Lycett offered to give a quarter of a million of dollars, on condition that a like sum should be added, making half a million of dollars, to secure the erection of fifty new chapels. More than four fifths of the amount required has been secured, and several of the new chapels are now in process of erection. This will mark a new era in the history of London Methodism; and thousands of the neglected poor, and their children after them, will fill these fifty chapels with grateful praise for the wise liberality that provided them. Other Independent Churches in England are engaged in similar work; but we come now to the Churches of our own country.

Church Extension among the Presbyterians.

The Presbyterians seem to have been the pioneers in this branch of church-work in the United States. It was at first instituted as a department of home missionary labor among the

Old School Presbyterians in 1844, shortly after the division recently so happily terminated. The importance and value of the work so grew upon the convictions of the denomination, and its peculiar character so developed, that in 1854 the General Assembly separated it from the home mission work and gave it the advantage of a distinct management, under the direction of a board of nine members—four ministers and five elders—appointed by the General Assembly, and known as "The Trustees of the Church Erection Fund of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." The place of business was established in New York city, and an act of incorporation was granted by the legislature of the State, March 31, 1855. The plan was amended and matured still further by the General Assembly in 1866, and under it, as then revised, the work was carried forward until the union of the two bodies was consummated in 1869. A similar board was instituted in the New School body about the same time, and was located at St. Louis, where its affairs were administered until the union was consummated. Its legal existence is still perpetuated for the care of any bequests that may have been left to it, and to meet similar necessities; but all the funds and business of the old boards have been transferred to the new.

This new board is composed of twenty-one members—ten ministers and eleven elders. They are divided into three classes, each class holding over three years, so that one third of the board is appointed at each session of the General Assembly. The board elects its own officers, including the corresponding secretary, who is the executive officer charged with the administration of its affairs. Its first meeting was held in New York, the place of its business, in June, 1870, when Rev. Dr. Few Smith was elected president, and Rev. H. R. Wilson, D.D., corresponding secretary.

The general plans of the old boards have been, with some modifications suggested by experience and requisite to unity, adopted by the new, and their work has flown together in the reunited Church as smoothly as the current of two great rivers. They have in their separate courses accomplished a work of great value to Presbyterian Christianity, and now unite to flow on with increased volume of power for good. The or-

Old School Presbyterians in 1844, shortly after the division recently so happily terminated. The importance and value of the work so grew upon the convictions of the denomination, and its peculiar character so developed, that in 1854 the General Assembly separated it from the home mission work and gave it the advantage of a distinct management, under the direction of a board of nine members—four ministers and five elders—appointed by the General Assembly, and known as "The Trustees of the Church Erection Fund of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." The place of business was established in New York city, and an act of incorporation was granted by the legislature of the State, March 31, 1855. The plan was amended and matured still further by the General Assembly in 1860, and under it, as then revised, the work was carried forward until the union of the two bodies was consummated in 1869. A similar board was instituted in the New School body about the same time, and was located at St. Louis, where its affairs were administered until the union was consummated. Its legal existence is still perpetuated for the care of any bequests that may have been left to it, and to meet similar necessities; but all the funds and business of the old boards have been transferred to the new.

The new board is composed of twenty-one members—ten ministers and eleven elders. They are divided into three classes, each class holding over three years, so that one third of the board is appointed at each session of the General Assembly. The board elects its own officers, including the corresponding secretary, who is the executive officer charged with the administration of its affairs. Its first meeting was held in New York, the place of its business, in June, 1870, when Rev. Dr. Ezra Smith was elected president, and Rev. H. R. Wilson, D.D., corresponding secretary.

The general plans of the old boards have been, with some modifications suggested by experience and requests to duty, adopted by the new, and their work has flown together in the reunited Church as smoothly as the current of two great rivers. They have in their separate courses accomplished a work of great value to Presbyterian Christianity, and now unite to flow on with increased volume of power for good. The arganization is compact and strong, and is under the immediate control of the General Assembly, the highest council of the Church. Its methods are well adjusted to a wise and economical use of the funds committed to its care. These are derived from collections in Churches, individual contributions, legacies, interest on Permanent Fund and the Memorial Fund.

The entire receipts for the year ending May 1, 1871, were $157,116 61, being a larger sum than was contributed to both boards the preceding year. The appropriations amounted to $145,292 22, divided among two hundred and twenty Churches in twenty-eight States and Territories, an average per Church of about $660.

With this report before it the last General Assembly adopted the following suggestive minute:

> While we rejoice in these evidences of a growing interest in this branch of the work of evangelization, *so fundamental to all permanent success*, we record the conviction that the Church has not yet attained a true conception of its vast importance and power in the work of conquering the continent for Christ.

CHURCH EXTENSION AMONG CONGREGATIONALISTS

Is under the direction of the "American Congregational Union," organized and incorporated in New York in 1853. The original object was "to promote, by general correspondence, by giving and obtaining needful information, and other friendly offices, the interests of the Congregational Churches, and to aid such as are feeble but promising in erecting houses of worship."

The primary design at the time of the organization was evidently to supply a much-needed means of communication in a Christian body that by the fundamental principle of its polity was without ecclesiastical ties, and to bring parishless pastors and pastorless parishes into communication, as well as to open and supply new fields. The purpose stated in the last clause of the extract was at the time secondary. It was designed to be practically a home missionary society, with the work of Church extension appended. But as the Union went forward to meet the providential necessities as they opened before it, the secondary object of its organization rapidly became its primary work. Its business is under the direction of a board of twenty-

two trustees, whose regular meetings are held monthly, and its executive work is done by two corresponding secretaries, Rev. Ray Palmer, D.D., of New York, and Rev. Christopher Cushing, of Boston.

A summary of the work accomplished from the organization of the Union to May 1, 1871, is given in the Report, or "Manual," for the year closing with that date. It has during this period appropriated in aid of Congregational Churches $375,599 47, with which it has aided to build seven hundred and twenty-nine houses of worship; the average, "including loans, exceptional grants, and special appropriations," being about $515 per Church. The total cost of the churches thus aided is estimated at $2,500,000. The annual receipts of the Union are increasing every year, the last reported being for the year ending May 1, 1871, $51,261 39. The number of Churches aided this year was sixty-five, scattered through nineteen different States and Territories.

In view of this brief summary of facts, and the rich field of Christian enterprise before the Churches of this country, it is no wonder that it was declared at the recent National Congregational Council at Oberlin, Ohio, that "the experience of a few years has clearly shown it to be one of the most imperative and fruitful of our Christian enterprises."

CHURCH EXTENSION AMONG THE BAPTISTS.

This work among our Baptist brethren has recently been made a separate department in "The American Baptist Home Mission Society." The Society itself was organized in New York in 1832, and it has accomplished a vast work for the denomination in the years that have followed. It is now divided into three departments—the Northern, the Southern, and the Church Edifice—each having the service of a corresponding secretary.

The first two are of a general missionary character, the division being merely geographical, the line being on the northern boundary of Virginia, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Texas. The Southern includes the republic of Mexico, which is regarded as a very promising mission field. It has also a distinct fund, to which special contributions are invited, for work among two trustees, whose regular meetings are held monthly, and its executive work is done by two corresponding secretaries, Rev. Ray Palmer, D.D., of New York, and Rev. Christopher Cushing, of Boston.

A summary of the work accomplished from the organization of the Union to May 1, 1873, is given in the Report, or "Manual," for the year closing with that date. It has during this period appropriated in aid of Congregational Churches $273,369.47, with which it has aided to build seven hundred and twenty-nine houses of worship; the average, "including loans, exceptional grants, and special appropriations," being about $344 per Church. The total cost of the churches thus aided is estimated at $2,300,000. The annual receipts of the Union are increasing every year, the last reported being for the year ending May 1, 1873, $81,281 80. The number of Churches aided this year was sixty-five, scattered through nineteen different States and Territories.

In view of this brief summary of facts, and the vast field of Christian enterprise before the Churches of this country, it is no wonder that it was declared at the recent National Congregational Council at Oberlin, Ohio, that "the experience of a few years has clearly shown it to be one of the most imperative and fruitful of our Christian enterprises."

Church Extension among the Baptists.

This work among our Baptist brethren has recently been made a separate department in "The American Baptist Home Mission Society." The Society itself was organized in New York in 1832, and it has accomplished a vast work for the denomination in the years that have followed. It is now divided into three departments—the Northern, the Southern, and the Church Edifice—each having the service of a corresponding secretary.

The first two are of a general missionary character, the division being merely geographical, the line being on the northern boundary of Virginia, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Texas. The Southern includes the republic of Mexico, which is regarded as a very promising mission field. It has also a distinct fund, to which special contributions are invited, for work among the freedmen, among whom it has established some excellent schools.

The Church Edifice department is yet in its infancy, having been established only three years ago as a distinct bureau. The plan is to create a Loan Fund of half a million of dollars, to be administered upon strict business principles. The failure of any Church to pay the interest when due will subject it to immediate foreclosure of mortgage—a rule that has already been enforced in two or three cases with the most salutary effect, the mere beginning of legal proceedings serving to stir up the recusant Churches to the required promptness.

The work of obtaining the desired half million of dollars is being prosecuted with great earnestness and ability by the Corresponding Secretary of the Department, Rev. E. E. L. Taylor, D.D., of New York.

At the end of the first year the Society gave its judgment of the enterprise as follows:

> No one department of the Society's operations exceed in importance that of its effort to raise the sum of $500,000 as a Permanent Church Edifice Fund; and it is cause for sincere gratitude that this undertaking has met with universal approval and has been favorably inaugurated.

The Report for the year 1871 says:

> Although this is but the third annual report of the Board on the Church Edifice Fund, as a distinct department of the home mission work, we can assure the Society that *no part of its operations* has in so short a time taken a deeper hold of the hearts of the more intelligent membership, or yielded more abundant or satisfactory returns. The practical character of the enterprise especially commends itself to the approbation of our far-seeing men of business. . . .
>
> Over sixty houses of worship have been erected during the past year that otherwise would not have been built, and most valuable Church property has been saved to the denomination, to the value of more than $100,000, which otherwise would have been lost.
>
> The prospect for the completion of the entire half million subscription to this fund was never more encouraging. We feel confident that the "*ten men*" to make up one half this sum by a subscription of $25,000 each will soon be obtained, and that the residue not already subscribed will speedily be forthcoming.

the freedmen, among whom it has established some excellent schools.

The Church Edifice department is yet in its infancy, having been established only three years ago as a distinct bureau. The plan is to create a Loan Fund of half a million of dollars, to be administered upon strict business principles. The failure of any Church to pay the interest when due will subject it to immediate foreclosure of mortgage—a rule that has already been enforced in two or three cases with the most salutary effect, the mere beginning of legal proceedings serving to stir up the recreant Churches to the required promptness.

The work of obtaining the desired half million of dollars is being prosecuted with great earnestness and ability by the Corresponding Secretary of the Department, Rev. E. E. L. Taylor, D.D., of New York.

At the end of the first year the Society gave its judgment of the enterprise as follows:

> No one department of the Society's operations exceeds in importance that of its effort to raise the sum of $500,000 as a Permanent Church Edifice Fund; and it is cause for sincere gratitude that this undertaking has met with universal approval and has been favorably inaugurated.

The Report for the year 1871 says:

> Although this is but the third annual report of the Board on the Church Edifice Fund, as a distinct department of the home mission work, we can assure the Society that no part of its operations has, in so short a time taken a deeper hold of the hearts of the more intelligent membership, or yielded more abundant or satisfactory returns. The practical character of the enterprise especially commends itself to the apprehension of our far-seeing men of business. . . .
>
> Over sixty houses of worship have been erected during the past year that otherwise would not have been built, and most valuable Church property has been saved to the denomination, to the value of more than $100,000, which otherwise would have been lost.
>
> The prospect for the completion of the entire half million subscription to this fund was never more encouraging. We feel confident that the "ten men" to make up one half this sum by a subscription of $25,000 each will soon be obtained, and that the residue not already subscribed will speedily be forthcoming.

CHURCH EXTENSION IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH—HISTORICAL RÉSUMÉ.

The Church Extension Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized by direction of the General Conference of 1864.

The necessity for such organization had long been felt—felt most in those Conferences where feeble Churches embarrassed with debts, and congregations with no suitable places of worship most abounded; but felt also in the stronger Conferences, especially in the larger cities, to which the weak and embarrassed Churches were constrained to send their pastors as special agents, until they had become so numerous that they could no longer be admitted to the pulpits to state their wants, and in many cases business men had even instructed their pastors not to furnish them with their names and places of business, as they could not afford to give the time required to hear their story of poverty and want.

In some of the Conferences this felt necessity had found expression in conference organizations, through which relief had been sought; but as in most Conferences where the necessity was greatest all the Churches were comparatively weak, the channels were not thereby opened to the places of power, and but little good resulted. Perhaps the only exception to this rule was found in the "Church Aid Society of the New England Conference," in which were Churches both weak and strong, and through which much good had, therefore, been accomplished within the Conference. But no channels were opened by it through which aid could flow beyond the conference bounds. Some organization was still needed by which the weak of the remotest points could be connected with the strong at the centers of wealth, by which a free, generous circulation of sympathy and aid should flow from the heart to all the extremities, giving life and health and power to the whole body. This necessity was felt most at the extremities, where the greatest destitution existed and the means of supply were most difficult of access. The Upper Iowa Conference had felt deeply the want, and the present Corresponding Secretary, then one of its delegates in the General Conference, after consultation with his codelegates and others, resolved with

them to bring, and if need be urge, the subject upon the attention of the General Conference. Accordingly on the fifth day of the session a resolution was offered and adopted instructing the Committee on Missions to "inquire into the expediency of forming a General Church Extension Society, with a view of securing more ample church accommodations in the newer portions of our work, and also to assist feeble societies, and to report at an early day." On the ninth day a plan of organization was presented and referred to the Committee. On the thirteenth day the Committee reported back the plan, with the recommendation that the whole subject be referred to the "Committee on Temporal Economy," to which the Missionary Committee thought the subject more properly belonged. On the seventeenth day the Committee on Temporal Economy reported favorably on the general subject, and recommended that the plan submitted be published in the "Daily Advocate." A substitute was moved, accepted, and adopted, providing for a Committee of Seven to report at once a plan of organization. On the nineteenth day the Committee was announced, and consisted of Edwin E. Griswold, A. J. Kynett, S. C. Thomas, M. Raymond, B. N. Spahr, D. L. Dempsey, and R. Nelson. On the same evening the Committee met in the vestry of St. George's Church, and at once agreed upon a report, previously prepared by a member of the Committee, which was presented the next day and laid upon the table to be printed. It referred to the great importance of the end proposed, recited some of the circumstances that made it necessary, and declared that as the interests involved were those of the whole Church, the representatives of the whole Church should take immediate action. It appreciated the difficulties of the movement, but thought that, as it was so essentially missionary in its character, the experience of the Church in that department might be made available in the new work. It submitted a constitution, modeled after that of the Missionary Society, and proposed immediate organization, with some amendments of the Discipline adjusted thereto.

On the evening of the last day of the session the report came up for final action. Two or three adverse motions were laid upon the table, and the report was adopted. In order to complete the organization, Bishop Simpson and Drs. Castle and them to bring, and if need be urge, the subject upon the attention of the General Conference. Accordingly on the fifth day of the session a resolution was offered and adopted instructing the Committee on Missions to "inquire into the expediency of forming a General Church Extension Society, with a view of securing more ample church accommodations in the newer portions of our work, and also to assist feeble societies, and to report at an early day." On the ninth day a plan of organization was presented and referred to the Committee. On the thirteenth day the Committee reported back the plan, with the recommendation that the whole subject be referred to the "Committee on Temporal Economy," to which the Missionary Committee thought the subject more properly belonged. On the seventeenth day the Committee on Temporal Economy reported favorably on the general subject, and recommended that the plan submitted be published in the "Daily Advocate." A substitute was moved, accepted, and adopted, providing for a Committee of Seven to report at once a plan of organization. On the nineteenth day the Committee was announced, and consisted of Edwin B. Griswold, A. J. Kynett, S. G. Thomas, M. Raymond, B. N. Spahr, D. L. Dempsey, and R. Nelson. On the same evening the Committee met in the vestry of St. George's Church, and at once agreed upon a report, previously prepared by a member of the Committee, which was presented the next day and laid upon the table to be printed. It referred to the great importance of the end proposed, recited some of the circumstances that made it necessary, and declared that as the interests involved were those of the whole Church, the representatives of the whole Church should take immediate action. It apprehended the difficulties of the movement, but thought that, as it was so essentially missionary in its character, the experience of the Church in that department might be made available in the new work. It submitted a constitution, modeled after that of the Missionary Society, and proposed immediate organization, with some amendments of the Discipline adjusted thereto.

On the evening of the last day of the session the report came up for final action. Two or three adverse motions were laid upon the table, and the report was adopted. In order to complete the organization, Bishop Simpson and Drs. Castle and

Bartine were appointed a committee to designate the first board of officers and managers, who should become incorporated, and the Bishops were directed, on the incorporation of the board, to appoint a corresponding secretary.

The Committee appointed to designate the officers and managers performed the duty assigned it January 3, 1865, and the officers and board thus constituted obtained an act of incorporation from the legislature of Pennsylvania on the 13th of March following, and in July the Bishops, at their meeting held in Erie, Pa., appointed Rev. Samuel Y. Monroe, D.D., corresponding secretary, who shortly afterward entered upon his duties.

At the first meeting of the General Committee of Church Extension in November, 1865, the war having closed and the whole South being thrown open to our Church, the Committee was deeply impressed with the necessity for larger work in the South as well as in the West, and believing that the spirit of liberality that had been evoked by the Sanitary and Christian Commissions, whose work had closed, could be enlisted in behalf of the work of the Church, and that the importance and value of this new department would be at once commended to the whole Church, ventured to ask for $200,000 for the first year, and authorized the appropriation of that amount if raised among the Conferences as designated by the Committee.

The constitution of the new Society being closely modeled after that of the Missionary Society, and further details not having been devised, the methods of the latter were too closely followed for the new form of work.

The opinion obtained to a large extent that the authorization of appropriations by the General Committee was in effect an appropriation to the Conferences severally, the same as in the case of the Missionary Society, and that it only remained that each Conference should, by its Committee on Church Extension, determine the disbursement to be made among needy Churches, and for the bishops presiding to draw the drafts. This course was adopted until drafts had been issued to the amount of over $100,000, payable in quarterly installments.

When the General Committee assembled in November, 1866, it was found that the total receipts of the Society from its organization to that time had been less than $60,000, leaving a

Bishops were appointed a committee to designate the first board of officers and managers, who should become incorporated, and the Bishops were directed, on the incorporation of the board, to appoint a corresponding secretary.

The Committee appointed to designate the officers and managers performed the duty assigned it January 3, 1865, and the officers and board thus constituted obtained an act of incorporation from the legislature of Pennsylvania on the 13th of March following, and in July the Bishops, at their meeting held in Erie, Pa., appointed Rev. Samuel Y. Monroe, D.D., corresponding secretary, who shortly afterward entered upon his duties.

At the first meeting of the General Committee of Church Extension in November, 1865, the war having closed and the whole South being thrown open to our Church, the Committee was deeply impressed with the necessity for larger work in the South as well as in the West, and believing that the spirit of liberality that had been evoked by the Sanitary and Christian Commissions, whose work had closed, could be enlisted in behalf of the work of the Church, and that the importance and value of this new department would be at once commended to the whole Church, ventured to ask for $250,000 for the first year, and authorized the appropriation of that amount if raised among the Conferences as designated by the Committee.

The constitution of the new Society being closely modeled after that of the Missionary Society, and further details not having been devised, the methods of the latter were too closely followed for the new form of work.

The opinion obtained to a large extent that the authorization of appropriations by the General Committee was in effect an appropriation to the Conferences severally, the same as in the case of the Missionary Society, and that it only remained that each Conference should, by its Committee on Church Extension, determine the disbursement to be made among needy Churches, and for the Bishops presiding to draw the drafts. This course was adopted until drafts had been issued to the amount of over $100,000, payable in quarterly installments.

When the General Committee assembled in November, 1866, it was found that the total receipts of the Society from its organization to that time had been less than $60,000, leaving a deficit on the first year of over $140,000. This disappointed the expectation of the preceding year, and foreshadowed what has since been clearly revealed, that the work of introducing a new cause into a large communion, where its success must depend upon the support of a million of people, and the earnest co-operation of thousands of pastors, is not the work of a single year, even though large liberality has been already developed in behalf of other causes. But what should be done? The vast field was every-where open before us, and every-where "white to the harvest." Never before had such an opportunity been presented to the Christian Church. The new Society that had been called into being to "aid in the newer portions of our work," looked out in its new life to see more than three fourths of the field the Church was called to occupy *new*. Besides, many of the old Conferences urged the wants of feeble Churches within their own bounds upon the Society, and the idea prevailed largely that the entire work of aiding all who needed help to build churches was to be done by the Society. The aggregate amount solicited for the second year was nearly equal to that which the Missionary Society had attained after half a century's toil. This the Committee dared not ask, but to ask for less than for the preceding year would seem to indicate a less necessity. This the facts would not admit. It was urged in behalf of the claim of the older Conferences that if permitted to use half of their collections within their own bounds a deeper interest would be awakened and the collections largely increased. Though the result suggested was doubted, and the policy involved a serious change of the original intent, it was conceded, and a call was issued for $255,400 and the disbursement of the amount authorized as before, except that the issuing of drafts was restrained until the treasury might be in condition to protect them.

But most of the drafts issued the preceding year were still outstanding, and to protect even these would require receipts within the next ensuing five months equal to all the Society had received from the beginning. The Corresponding Secretary was with good reason apprehensive, but renewed his efforts with increasing zeal. He appealed by circular letters and through the Church papers to all the pastors, but not one in a hundred responded. Scarcely one in a thousand realized the deficit on the first year of over $140,000. This disappointed the expectation of the preceding year, and first indicated what has since been clearly revealed, that the work of introducing a new cause into a large communion, where its success must depend upon the support of a million of people, and the earnest co-operation of thousands of pastors, is not the work of a single year, even though large liberality has been already developed in behalf of other causes. But what should be done? The vast field was every-where open before us, and every-where "white to the harvest." Never before had such an opportunity been presented to the Christian Church. The new Society that had been called into being to "aid in the newer portions of our work," looked out in its new life to see more than three-fourths of the field the Church was called to occupy. Besides, many of the old Conferences urged the wants of feeble Churches within their own bounds upon the Society, and the idea prevailed largely that the entire work of aiding all who needed help to build churches was to be done by the Society. The aggregate amount solicited for the second year was nearly equal to that which the Missionary Society had attained after half a century's toil. This the Committee dared not ask, but to ask for less than for the preceding year would seem to indicate a less necessity. This the facts would not admit. It was urged in behalf of the claim of the older Conferences that if permitted to use half of their collections within their own bounds, a deeper interest would be awakened and the collections largely increased. Though the result suggested was doubted, and the policy involved a serious change of the original intent, it was conceded, and a call was issued for $288,409 and the disbursement of the amount authorized as before, except that the issuing of drafts was restrained until the treasury might be in condition to protect them.

But most of the drafts issued the preceding year were still outstanding, and to protect even these would require receipts within the next ensuing five months equal to all the Society had received from the beginning. The Corresponding Secretary was with good reason apprehensive, but renewed his efforts with increasing zeal. He appealed by circular letters and through the Church papers to all the pastors, but not one in a hundred responded. Scarcely one in a thousand realized the situation. He flew from Conference to Conference and from Church to Church. If he could have had the whole Church, or even one fourth of it, for his audience, the calamity would have been averted. But how few could he reach! If all the pastors could have been brought to realize the emergency, and to have given ten minutes any Sunday morning to its statement to their people, within a single week the treasury would have been made strong enough to pass the crisis. *If our practical discipline were as thorough as our organization the whole Church could be thus commanded in an emergency.* But the appeal was unread or unheeded. The treasury received but little beyond what the Secretary himself collected. Drafts came in rapidly, the money to protect them slowly. The crisis was soon reached. The Society was young, unknown in the financial world, without credit. A mere child in years and strength, it had been called upon to do the work of a giant. The result was inevitable. The Secretary had struggled nobly. No man could have plead the cause more eloquently or earnestly than he. But his voice alone was heard where thousands should have spoken. Alas, that voice was soon to be hushed in death! Weary, disheartened, sick from long protracted toil and sleepless anxiety to avert the calamity now upon the Society that had been committed to his care, he started on Saturday, February 9, 1867, from his home in Camden to meet an engagement for the next day to plead his cause in one of the churches of Brooklyn. Stepping to the platform of the car, as the train was nearing Jersey City, by some accident still vailed in mystery, he fell from the train unobserved by human eye. His body was in a few minutes found by strangers and identified by papers on his person, but his soul was at rest with God.

The Church was startled at this sudden death of one of her leading ministers; but it was her loss as a Church rather than the loss the Society had suffered that was most deeply felt. There was a real necessity that all should rally to supply the service of which the latter was deprived, but there was only questioning and doubt as to whether it was possible to save the cause from utter ruin, or whether it was desirable to continue the organization beyond the ensuing General Conference.

During the vacancy occasioned by the death of Dr. Monroe situation. He flew from Conference to Conference and from Church to Church. If he could have had the whole Church, or even one fourth of it, for his audience, the calamity would have been averted. But how few could he reach! If all the pastors could have been brought to realize the emergency, and to have given ten minutes any Sunday morning to its statement to their people, within a single week the treasury would have been made strong enough to pass the crisis. *If our practical discipline were as thorough as our organization the whole Church could be thus commanded in an emergency.* But the appeal was unread or unheeded. The treasury received but little beyond what the Secretary himself collected. Drafts came in rapidly, the means to protect them dwindled. The crisis was soon reached. The Society was young, unknown in the financial world, without credit. A mere child in years and strength, it had been called upon to do the work of a giant. The result was inevitable. The Secretary had struggled nobly. No man could have plead the cause more eloquently or earnestly than he. But his voice alone was heard where thousands should have spoken. Alas, that voice was soon to be hushed in death! Weary, disheartened, sick from long protracted toil and sleepless anxiety to avert the calamity now upon the Society that had been committed to his care, he started on Saturday, February 9, 1867, from his home in Camden to meet an engagement for the next day to plead the cause in one of the churches of Brooklyn. Stepping to the platform of the car, as the train was nearing Jersey City, by some accident still veiled in mystery, he fell from the train unobserved by human eyes. His body was in a few minutes found by strangers and identified by papers on his person, but his soul was at rest with God.

The Church was startled at this sudden death of one of her leading ministers; but it was her loss as a Church rather than the loss the Society had suffered that was most deeply felt. There was a real necessity that all should rally to supply the service of which the latter was deprived, but there was only questioning and doubt as to whether it was possible to save the cause from utter ruin, or whether it was desirable to continue the organization beyond the ensuing General Conference.

During the vacancy occasioned by the death of Dr. Monroe the duties of the position were, by action of the Board, imposed upon the Recording Secretary, Rev. Dr. Pattison, who conducted the correspondence and rendered other efficient services as his duties to an important pastoral charge would permit. The duty of filling the vacancy was devolved by the constitution upon the bishops. In April they tendered the appointment to Rev. Dr. Tiffany, who declined, when, in May, the present incumbent was appointed and accepted in June, and entered upon his duties the first day of July following. A thorough knowledge of the affairs of the Society was the first thing necessary to intelligent work. The first secretary had been so constantly employed in visiting Conferences and soliciting funds that he had found no time to organize the work of the office. It was therefore a tedious and difficult task to acquire a thorough knowledge of the situation, and still more difficult to devise and execute methods of relief and to inspire confidence in its ultimate success.

It was soon ascertained that up to that date only about $18,000 had been received by the Treasurer in response to the appeal for $255,400; that there were over $50,000 of drafts still outstanding, many of which had been protested; that, besides these, the whole amount of the appropriations for the second year, as well as the balance on the first, had been divided out among applicants in the several Conferences, and had been received by expectant Churches as promises of the Society to be redeemed within a year. With an average income of $40,000 a year—which was above that to which the Society had yet attained—it would have required ten years to pay the obligations thus imposed the first two. The Society could not afford to be that much behind its work.

It was wisely determined,

1. That the Board could not be required to disburse more than the Church placed in its hands; and,

2. That in disbursing that amount it should observe something of the equity indicated in the action of the General Committee.

To redeem drafts that had been hypothecated, members of the Board lent their personal credit, and borrowed the money when they were called in for payment. Drafts that had not been used were required to be returned, and the cases to aid which they had been prematurely issued were entered as apthe duties of the position were, by action of the Board, imposed upon the Recording Secretary, Rev. Dr. Pattison, who conducted the correspondence and rendered other efficient service as his duties to an important pastoral charge would permit. The duty of filling the vacancy was devolved by the organization upon the bishops. In April they tendered the appointment to Rev. Dr. Tiffany, who declined, when, in May, the present incumbent was appointed and accepted in June, and entered upon his duties the first day of July following. A thorough knowledge of the affairs of the Society was the first thing necessary to intelligent work. The first secretary had been so constantly employed in visiting Conferences and collecting funds that he had found no time to organize the work of the office. It was therefore a tedious and difficult task to acquire a thorough knowledge of the situation, and still more difficult to devise and execute methods of relief and to inspire confidence in its ultimate success.

It was soon ascertained that up to that date only about $12,000 had been received by the Treasurer in response to the appeal for $250,000; that there were over $50,000 of drafts still outstanding, many of which had been protested; that, besides these, the whole amount of the appropriations for the second year, as well as the balance on the first, had been divided out among applicants in the several Conferences, and had been received by expectant Churches as promises of the Society to be redeemed within a year. With an average income of $10,000 a year—which was above that to which the Society had yet attained—it would have required ten years to pay the obligations thus imposed the first two. The Society could not afford to be that much behind its work.

It was wisely determined,

1. That the Board could not be required to disburse more than the Church placed in its hands; and,

2. That in disbursing that amount it should observe something of the equity indicated in the action of the General Committee.

To redeem drafts that had been hypothecated, members of the Board lent their personal credit, and increased the money when they were called in for payment. Drafts that had not been used were required to be returned, and the sums to all which they had been prematurely issued were entered as applications for aid, to be aided as their circumstances might require and subsequent receipts might justify. In this way, by the time the General Conference of 1868 assembled the Society had been relieved of its most serious embarrassments, and the confidence of the Church in good measure restored. Still the proposition to consolidate its work, as well as that of the Freedmen's Aid Society, with that of the Missionary Society was not without advocates. This question was the subject of more or less inquiry in at least five different Committees of the General Conference; namely, Missionary, Church Extension, Freedmen's Aid, a Committee to Inquire into the Practicability of Reducing the Number of Collections, and a Committee of Conference from the four named, *and all reported against it.* Experience, however, had clearly taught the necessity of important modifications in the plans of the Society.

After careful study of the methods of other Churches in this department—especially of those of the Wesleyans in Great Britain and of the Presbyterians in this country—on recommendation of the Board of Managers the General Conference adopted an amended constitution, and inserted the section "Of Church Extension" in the Discipline.

The charter was revised, to correspond with the new constitution, by the legislature of Pennsylvania, on the 11th of March following, and the Society entered upon a new and enlarged career of usefulness.

ORGANIZATION AND PLANS.

As now organized, the Society embodies—

I. THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF CHURCH EXTENSION.—This is composed of one member from each episcopal district, is appointed by the bishops, and meets in November of each year in the city of Philadelphia, and acts jointly with the bishops, managers, corresponding secretary, and treasurer in determining for the ensuing year—

1. The amount the Church shall be asked to contribute through the regular collections;

2. The amount that may be appropriated by donations and loans; and,

3. The distribution of both collections to be made and appropriations authorized among the Conferences severally.

plications for aid, to be added as their circumstances might require and subsequent receipts might justify. In this way, by the time the General Conference of 1868 assembled the Society had been relieved of its most serious embarrassments, and the confidence of the Church in good measure restored. Still the proposition to consolidate its work, as well as that of the Freedmen's Aid Society, with that of the Missionary Society was not without advocates. This question was the subject of more or less inquiry in, at least five different Committees of the General Conference; namely, Missionary, Church Extension, Freedmen's Aid, a Committee to Inquire into the Practicability of Reducing the Number of Collections, and a Committee of Conference from the four named, and all reported against it. Experience, however, had clearly taught the necessity of important modifications in the plans of the Society.

After careful study of the methods of other Churches in this department—especially of those of the Wesleyans in Great Britain and of the Presbyterians in this country—on recommendation of the Board of Managers the General Conference adopted an amended constitution, and inserted the section "Of Church Extension" in the Discipline.

The charter was revised, to correspond with the new constitution, by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, on the 11th of March following, and the Society entered upon a new and enlarged career of usefulness.

ORGANIZATION AND PLANS.

As now organized, the Society embraces—

I. THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF CHURCH EXTENSION.—This is composed of one member from each episcopal district, is appointed by the bishops, and meets in November of each year in the city of Philadelphia, and acts jointly with the bishops, managers, corresponding secretary, and treasurer in determining for the ensuing year—

1. The amount the Church shall be asked to contribute through the regular collections;

2. The amount that may be appropriated by donations and loans; and,

3. The distribution of both collections to be made and appropriations authorized among the Conferences severally.

Composed as it is, it is well calculated to secure an equitable distribution of the burdens and benefits of the Society. This is its design. *It makes no appropriations.* The effect of its action is simply to fix the limits within which appropriations may be made within the Conferences severally, and forestalls any undue influence from local considerations.

II. THE PARENT BOARD OF MANAGERS.—This is composed of thirty ministers and thirty-five laymen, elected annually at the annual meeting in November for the next ensuing calendar year. The officers, except the corresponding secretary, who is elected by the General Conference, are elected at the first meeting in January of each year, at which time also standing committees for the year are appointed, the most important of which are, the executive and finance, and on applications for aid. The parent board is charged with "the management and disposition of all the affairs and property of the Society." The business of the board is prepared in committee, and the regular meetings are held once a month. But in granting appropriations it must recognize the limits fixed for each Conference by the General Committee.

III. IN EACH CONFERENCE A CONFERENCE BOARD OF CHURCH EXTENSION.—There are no auxiliary societies. Under provisions of the Discipline the Conference itself appoints the "Board of Church Extension," and under both the Discipline and the constitution of the parent society this Board has, "under the direction of the parent board, charge of all the interests and work of Church Extension within the bounds of the Conference."

It should see that the amount asked of the Conference is distributed for collection among the several districts and pastoral charges, and carefully examine and determine upon all applications for aid from within the Conference, recommending appropriations only within the limits fixed by the General Committee.

It is furnished by the parent board with the necessary blank books, with printed instructions bound in them, and is expected to keep a careful record of all its proceedings and an accurate account of the amounts asked and received each year from each pastoral charge. It is required to report each year to the annual conference, and at the same time to the parent board. This report should show the amounts asked and received from

Composed as it is, it is well calculated to secure an equitable distribution of the burdens and benefits of the Society. This is its design. *It makes no appropriations.* The effect of its action is simply to fix the limits within which appropriations may be made within the Conferences severally, and forestall any undue influences from local considerations.

II. The Parent Board of Managers.—This is composed of thirty ministers and thirty-five laymen, elected annually at the annual meeting in November for the next ensuing calendar year. The officers, except the corresponding secretary, who is elected by the General Conference, are elected at the first meeting in January of each year, at which time also standing committees for the year are appointed, the most important of which are, the executive and finance, and on applications for aid. The parent board is charged with "the management and disposition of all the affairs and property of the Society." The business of the board is prepared in committees, and the regular meetings are held once a month. But in granting appropriations it must recognize the limits fixed for each Conference by the General Committee.

III. In each Conference a Conference Board of Church Extension.—There are no auxiliary societies. Under provisions of the Discipline the Conference itself appoints the "Board of Church Extension," and under both the Discipline and the constitution of the parent society this board has, "under the direction of the parent board, charge of all the interests and work of Church Extension within the bounds of the Conference."

It should see that the amount asked of the Conference is distributed for collection among the several districts and pastoral charges, and carefully examine and determine upon all applications for aid from within the Conference, recommending appropriations only within the limits fixed by the General Committee.

It is furnished by the parent board with the necessary blank books, with printed instructions bound in them, and is expected to keep a careful record of all its proceedings and an accurate account of the amounts asked and received each year from each pastoral charge. It is required to report each year to the annual conference, and at the same time to the parent board. This report should show the amounts asked and received from each pastoral charge, and the appropriations asked and recommended within the Conference.

APPLICATIONS FOR AID must be made upon blank forms furnished by the parent board, and which also embody full instructions as to the course to be pursued. These, properly filled out, give full information on the following points:

1. The object for which aid is asked—as to build, complete, pay debt, etc.
2. The number to be accommodated—of members, Sunday-school children, and congregation, and the population and prospective growth of the place.
3. The legal incorporation of the Church or trustees.
4. The site—its relations to the people, size and value of the grounds, and the title thereto.
5. The building—materials, style, size, number of rooms, and full description, and in building whether there are plans, detailed drawings, and specifications by a competent architect.
6. The actual or estimated cost when completed, how much has been paid, and how much debt is contracted, and how it is secured.
7. Available resources that may be applied to the object—from property, actual and probable subscription, and whether those interested have done and are doing all they can for themselves.
8. What amount of debt may with safety remain against the property, and how soon they propose to remove it.
9. Whether the property is or will be insured, in what company, and for what amount.
10. Whether the Church will, if aided, become self-supporting; how soon and to what extent it will probably aid in the general work of Church Extension, missions, etc., etc.
11. Any additional facts and circumstances that would bear upon the question of granting the aid desired.

This full information is followed by the statement of those seeking aid, that in their judgment the work proposed is necessary to the prosperity of the Church, and that it cannot be accomplished with any thing less than the amount asked. This is well calculated to throw the people immediately interested upon their own resources to the utmost extent.

The application should be signed by the trustees, but if they each pastoral charge, and the appropriations asked and recommended within the Conference.

APPLICATIONS FOR AID must be made upon blank forms furnished by the parent board, and which also embody full instructions as to the course to be pursued. These, properly filled out, give full information on the following points:

1. The object for which aid is asked—as to build, complete, pay debt, etc.

2. The number to be accommodated—of members, Sunday-school children, and congregation, and the population and prospective growth of the place.

3. The legal incorporation of the Church or trustees.

4. The site—its relations to the people, size and value of the grounds, and the title thereto.

5. The building—materials, style, size, number of rooms, and full description, and in building whether there are plans, detailed drawings, and specifications by a competent architect.

6. The actual or estimated cost when completed, how much has been paid, and how much debt is contracted, and how it is secured.

7. Available resources that may be applied to the object—from property, actual and probable subscription, and whether those interested have done and are doing all they can for themselves.

8. What amount of debt may with safety remain against the property, and how soon they propose to remove it.

9. Whether the property is or will be insured, in what company, and for what amount.

10. Whether the Church will, if aided, become self-supporting; how soon and to what extent it will probably aid in the general work of Church Extension, missions, etc., etc.

11. Any additional facts and circumstances that would bear upon the question of granting the aid desired.

This full information is followed by the statement of those asking aid, that in their judgment the work proposed is necessary to the prosperity of the Church, and that it cannot be accomplished with any thing less than the amount asked. This is well calculated to throw the people immediately interested upon their own resources to the utmost extent.

The application should be signed by the trustees, but if they are not yet organized and incorporated, it may be signed by a committee or by the persons applying, and in either case should be concurred in by the pastor and presiding elder.

It then goes before the conference board of church extension, which, being limited to a given sum for use within the conference, should exercise great care that the most needy and worthy cases may be aided without exhausting the amount authorized upon any who could and should provide for themselves. The conference board may decline the application, in which case its action is final, or it may recommend the amount asked, or any thing less, in which case its action is indorsed upon the application and it is forwarded to the corresponding secretary of the parent society. He refers it to the committee on applications, which, after careful examination, recommends to the parent board such action as it may deem wise. The parent board may, within the limits fixed by the general committee, grant the amount recommended by the conference board, or any thing less, or decline the application altogether; and in any case its action is final. The Church asking aid is duly notified of the action taken.

The INCOME OF THE SOCIETY is derived from two sources:

1. *From annual collections*, creating

THE GENERAL FUND.

The amount desired each year for this fund of the several conferences, districts, and pastoral charges is indicated to each in the manner heretofore described. It is by the Discipline made the duty of each pastor to "preach a sermon on this subject in each congregation once in every year, and solicit contributions from each in aid of the Church Extension Society." It is expected that each congregation will contribute at least the amount that has been indicated, and that the parent society will thereby receive the aggregate amount asked for by the general committee.

The parent board keeps an accurate account with each conference, and each conference board with every pastoral charge. The annual report of the parent society contains an exhibit of the amount asked and received of each conference, and that of the conference board of the amount asked and received of each district and pastoral charge. The latter should

be published in the conference minutes. In tabular form it would occupy but little space, and would stimulate that systematic and regular liberality so much needed in all our benevolent work. It would be published evidence, accessible to all who are interested, as to the fidelity of each pastor to the trust the Church reposes in his hands.

The *response to the amount asked*, not the aggregate sum secured irrespective of circumstances, is the true measure of fidelity in this part of a pastor's work. Two talents added to two is as good an increase as five added to five. The widow's mite was more for her than were all the gifts of the wealthy to them. This method of reporting collections is a proper recognition of this principle.

2. *From special donations and bequests*, creating

THE LOAN FUND.

In a multitude of cases the people are too weak to build within themselves, but would soon become strong by building a suitable church. If such could be aided by a temporary loan, bearing light interest, they would build at once, thereby securing large increase of strength, and in a few years would cheerfully return the amount borrowed, to be loaned again to others in like manner. To meet cases of this kind the *Loan Fund* was instituted under the following provisions:

First, No part of said fund shall ever be donated for any purpose, or used for current expenses, but shall be preserved without diminution, a *perpetual fund.*

Secondly, Said fund may be loaned to any Church or Society, without interest, in small sums, in no case exceeding five thousand dollars, or with interest, as occasion may require, and the board shall from time to time determine, in aid of the objects of the Church Extension Society.

Sums of five thousand dollars and upward, contributed by any one person, Church, or Conference, shall be named by the contributor, and shall constitute a separate Loan Fund, and the corresponding secretary shall report annually the investment thereof, and the work accomplished thereby.

The practical operation of the plan will be seen at a glance. With the NAMED FUNDS it would read thus: A. B. contributes to the Loan Fund $5,000 or more. Unless he direct otherwise it will be called the "A. B. LOAN FUND." Cases now weak, but that will with help become strong, apply for aid in accord-

ance with the form required by the Discipline of the Church and the constitution of the Society. Upon sufficient security, and terms agreed upon, the Society lends a part or the whole of the "A. B. LOAN FUND," securing the enterprise, and in the next annual report states the fact and the work accomplished thereby. On its return it lends it again in like manner, and reports the fact and results as before, and so on *perpetually.* At any future period a complete history of each of these funds may be obtained by simply collating the statements of the several annual reports concerning it.

This Loan Fund plan was adopted by the Board, July 22, 1867, and cordially approved by the Bishops and General Committee in November following. A year later the lamented Bishop Kingsley, after mature reflection, gave, in a brief address on the subject, the following beautiful epitome of the plan and of his estimate of it:

> I am exceedingly well pleased with the Loan Fund feature of the Society. I can think of nothing that impresses me more favorably, or *as* favorably, as putting money into this Loan Fund, to go on repeating itself, and reproducing its blessings from age to age. It don't stop simply with the first blessing. It helps build one church, and comes back again with the glad tidings of what it has done, and goes again and builds, or helps to build, another church, and coming back again says, "Here am I, send me," and goes again and again. There is something exceedingly beautiful to me in it, and I think when it gets fully before the business men of the Church, they will turn with special favor to this fund.

In this connection, provisions are made that those who may have means to be devoted to religious uses, but who may need or desire the income from the same during their life-time, shall receive an annuity equal to a reasonable interest on the amount they may contribute to the "Loan Fund," the said annuity to be paid annually or semi-annually, as the contributor may desire.

If placed here, their means, besides procuring, at least, the ordinary income, will, as their representative, be constantly doing a work of the first importance to the Church, and, under the general provisions for the administration of the Loan Fund, will report results every year.

Such are, in brief, the history and methods of our Church Extension Society. It came into being at the bidding of the ance with the form required by the Executive of the Church and the constitution of the Society. Upon sufficient security and terms agreed upon, the Society lends a part or the whole of the "A. E. LOAN FUND," receiving the mortgages, and in the next annual report states the fact and the work accomplished thereby. On its return it lends it again in like manner, and reports the fact and results as before, and so on *perpetually*. At any future period a complete history of each of these funds may be obtained by simply collecting the statements of the several annual reports concerning it.

This Loan Fund plan was adopted by the Board, July 22, 1867, and cordially approved by the Bishops and General Committee in November following. A year later the lamented Bishop Kingsley, after mature reflection, gave, in a brief address on the subject, the following beautiful epitome of the plan and of his estimate of it:

> I am exceedingly well pleased with the Loan Fund feature of the Society. I can think of nothing that impresses me more favorably, or as favorably, as putting money into this Loan Fund, to go on repeating itself, and reproducing its blessings from age to age. It don't stop simply with the first blessing. It helps build one church, and comes back again with the glad tidings of what it has done, and goes again and builds, or helps to build, another church, and coming back again says, "Here am I; send me," and goes again, and again. There is something exceedingly beautiful to me in it, and I think when it gets fully before the business men of the Church, they will turn with special favor to this fund.

In this connection, provisions are made that those who may have means to be devoted to religious uses, but who may need or desire the income from the same during their life-time, shall receive an annuity equal to a reasonable interest on the amount they may contribute to the "Loan Fund," the said annuity to be paid annually or semi-annually, as the contributor may desire.

If placed here, their means, besides procuring, at least, the ordinary income, will, as their representative, be constantly doing a work of the first importance to the Church, and, under the general provisions for the administration of the Loan Fund, will report results every year.

Such are, in brief, the history and methods of our Church Extension Society. It came into being at the bidding of the highest council of our Church. It came to meet a want long and deeply felt; but when it came, that want had grown to such magnitude that its young and inexperienced shoulders could not bear it, and it sank for a time beneath the burdens that were thrust upon it. But when these were lifted it rose into new life and strength, and now already has attained a goodly manhood. It has learned by experience, that dearest though best of schools. It adjusts itself wisely to its task, and, carefully measuring its strength, works up to the full measure of its power. Its growth is one of the marvels of our history. From the period of its organization to November 15, 1866, its receipts and disbursements were $59,277 17, and about 60 Churches were aided. From November 15, 1866, to November 15, 1867, they were $30,961 42, and 65 Churches were aided. From November 15, 1867, to December 31, 1868, they were $51,975 27, and 86 Churches were aided. For the year 1869 they were $77,714 53, and 79 Churches were aided.

The smaller number of Churches aided this year is explained by the fact that during the year money previously borrowed was returned to the amount of $21,400. For the year 1870 the receipts and disbursements were $103,433 44, and 210 Churches were aided. And for the year 1871 they were $165,941 81, and 233 Churches received aid.

This statement does not include amounts borrowed at any time, nor return of loans previously granted by the Society. It therefore shows the increasing receipts of the Society from year to year.

The aggregate receipts on the various branches of the Loan Fund, exclusive of amounts borrowed on bonds, up to January 1, 1872, are $119,742 30, of which $55,551 36 were donated to the Society without restriction, and $64,190 94 subject to life annuity.

The total indebtedness of the Society is represented in bonds, and January 1, 1872, was $31,800, while the Society holds for loans granted, notes, bonds, and mortgages to the amount of $133,972 25.

The interest receivable by the Society is more than equal to the interest and life annuities payable, and the plan insures a still larger difference in favor of the Society, without increasing the rate of interest receivable on loans.

None of our Church societies has ever encountered such serious difficulties as did this in its early history, yet no other has ever enjoyed such rapid growth. It required thirty-two years for our Missionary Society to reach an annual income equal to that of our sixth year in this, and it already leads all our other Church benevolences. It has rapidly moved to the front of every similar agency in Protestant Christendom, and yet its legitimate place is only beginning to be recognized. The value of its work in the past is but the earnest of what it will, with increasing strength, do in the future. It challenges the attention of all, but awakens jealousy in none. A few may for a time question whether it will not not reduce the income of the Missionary Society; but a knowledge of the facts and a little reflection will soon dissipate the apprehension. The actual facts and figures are against it. By aiding to build churches scores of missions are being made self-sustaining; and every one we help to build opens a new or an enlarged source of income for the future work of the whole Church. Recently one of the Baptist missionaries in Burmah, without solicitation, sent a thousand dollars to the Church Edifice Fund, and in so doing wrote:

> I fully believe that one thousand dollars so expended in America at the present time will be *four times as useful* as it would be if expended on heathen ground. The little Churches among the heathen will hereafter reap the benefit as well as the heathen also.

One of our own missionaries who went to India within the last year, before going gave nearly all he had ($1,000) to our Annuity Loan Fund. These cases indicate the true relation of these two great causes to each other, and the proper feeling to be cultivated toward them. The work of Church Extension cannot be carried forward in the home field without that of the Missionary Society, and the work of the Missionary Society is aided and strengthened by it; and by the united work of the two the Church is greatly strengthened for its work in foreign fields.

The Church is one, and its work is one—the conquest of the world for Christ. Let each and every branch of the Church, with every organized agency of power, move forward in "the unity of the spirit, in the bonds of peace," until the earth shall be full of the glory of the Lord.

None of our Church societies has ever encountered such serious difficulties as did this in its early history, yet no other has ever enjoyed such rapid growth. It required thirty-two years for our Missionary Society to reach an annual income equal to that of our sixth year in this, and it already leads all our other Church benevolences. It has rapidly moved to the front of every similar agency in Protestant Christendom, and yet its legitimate place is only beginning to be recognized. The value of its work in the past is but the earnest of what it will, with increasing strength, do in the future. It challenges the attention of all, but awakens jealousy in none. A few may for a time question whether it will not not rob the income of the Missionary Society; but a knowledge of the facts and a little reflection will soon dissipate the apprehension. The actual facts and figures are against it. By aiding to build churches scores of missions are being made self-sustaining; and every one we help to build opens a new or an enlarged source of income for the future work of the whole Church. Recently one of the Baptist missionaries in Burmah, without solicitation, sent a thousand dollars to the Church Edifice Fund, and in so doing wrote:

I fully believe that one thousand dollars so expended in America at the present time will be *four times as useful* as it would be if expended on heathen ground. The little Churches among the heathen will hereafter reap the benefit as well as the heathen also.

One of our own missionaries who went to India within the last year, before going gave nearly all he had ($1,000) to our Annuity Loan Fund. These cases indicate the true relation of these two great causes to each other, and the proper feeling to be cultivated toward them. The work of Church Extension cannot be carried forward in the home field without that of the Missionary Society, and the work of the Missionary Society is aided and strengthened by it; and by the united work of the two the Church is greatly strengthened for its work in foreign fields.

The Church is one, and its work is one—the conquest of the world for Christ. Let each and every branch of the Church, with every organized agency of power, move forward in "the unity of the spirit, in the bonds of peace," until the earth shall be full of the glory of the Lord.

ART. VII.—WORK FOR THE COMING GENERAL CONFERENCE.

WESLEYANISM, or Methodism, is coming to be regarded by the more thoughtful and philosophical minds "as one of the series of events through the medium of which Christianity has from the apostolic age continued to work its way onward toward its destined issue—the subjugation of the human family, and the universality of a pure religion." If this judgment be the true one, the future may be expected to unfold other and more striking agencies to that grand ultimate in the history of Christianity than Lutheranism or Wesleyanism. The watchman, therefore, with patience and faith should toil, and wait the movements of that One "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

To perpetuate the revival of which Wesley, Asbury, and others were the favored instruments, it became necessary to adopt methods of action and forms of order and government. For this work they appear to have been as strangely endowed or qualified as for the higher one with which they were, in the order of Providence, intrusted. And hence, not only is Methodism held in its life-force to be from God, but the great outlines of the system of government or church authority by which this life has been organized and developed, are of providential designation. Of these forms may be named the itinerancy—the itinerant episcopacy, itinerant presiding eldership, and itinerant pastorate; the lay ministry; the class organizations and leaderships, and the love-feasts; these features of church economy, adopted under divine designation in connection with the great outflow of salvation under the preaching of these men of God, should not be dispensed with until it becomes clear that as agencies they have accomplished their ministry.

If, therefore, providential designation with any degree of propriety can be pleaded for these features of Methodist church economy, the great men of Methodism ought to be a little wary as to how they lay hands upon them with the view of either their modification or expulsion from the system.

The same principle, namely, divine designation, should be recognized in the adoption of any new measure vitally affecting

the economy of Methodism. No measure of importance should be incorporated into the economy of the Church unless it has become clear that it is both fit and necessary, and will promote the great end of carrying the Church forward in her mission of salvation.

In the light of this principle, and of the facts by which it has been illustrated, the question, Has the hand of God been in the recent measures by which biblical institutes and lay representation have been interpolated into the economy of the Church? becomes a study of no little interest. The general culture of the masses of the people, requiring a more thoroughly cultivated evangelism on the part of the ministry, and the piety, fidelity, intelligence, wealth, and beneficence of large numbers of laymen, and their love for and thorough loyalty to the Church which has been the agent of their salvation, with their manifested desire for her advancement, would indicate the affirmative of this. Minor matters, proper and useful in all church organizations, may not be of such high import, and consequently may not require such care and scrutiny in connection with their adoption, and, being adopted, may more speedily pass away.

In the light of these preliminaries we inquire, Has the General Conference a work thrust upon it in the order of Providence, and by divine designation, upon which it should enter with all the care and prayer becoming its high position as the chief council of the Church and its only legislative body? We enter upon this subject simply in the light of suggestive inquiry, and consider, 1. Measures pertaining to women; 2. Measures pertaining to literature; 3. Measures pertaining to the itinerancy; 4. Measures pertaining to property.

I. MEASURES PERTAINING TO WOMEN.

During the past dozen years the attention and action of the Church has been employed chiefly upon a single measure, and this embracing, perhaps, but a third of its membership and a quarter of its piety. This action has been nearly completed in the admission of laymen into the General Conference to take part in the deliberations and legislation of that body, and prospectively, as all such measures have their logical results, into the annual conferences, to take part in transacting the business of those bodies. This was a measure well and proper to be done, the economy of Methodism. No measure of importance should be incorporated into the economy of the Church unless it has become clear that it is both fit and necessary, and will promote the great end of carrying the Church forward in her mission of salvation.

In the light of this principle, and of the facts by which it has been illustrated, the question, Has the hand of God been in the recent measures by which biblical deaconess and lay representation have been interpolated into the economy of the Church? becomes a study of no little interest. The general culture of the masses of the people, requiring a more thoroughly cultivated evangelism on the part of the ministry, and the piety, fidelity, intelligence, wealth, and beneficence of large numbers of laymen, and their love for and thorough loyalty to the Church which has been the agent of their salvation, with their manifested desire for her advancement, would indicate the affirmative of this. Minor matters, proper and useful in all church organizations, may not be of such high import, and consequently may not require such care and scrutiny in connection with their adoption, and, being adopted, may more speedily pass away.

In the light of these preliminaries we inquire, Has the General Conference a work thrust upon it in the order of Providence, and by divine designation, upon which it should enter with all the care and prayer becoming its high position as the chief council of the Church and its only legislative body? We enter upon this subject simply in the light of suggestive inquiry, and consider, 1. Measures pertaining to women; 2. Measures pertaining to literature; 3. Measures pertaining to the itinerancy; 4. Measures pertaining to property.

I. Measures Pertaining to Women.

During the past dozen years the attention and action of the Church has been employed chiefly upon a single measure, and this embracing, perhaps, but a third of its membership and a quarter of its piety. This action has been nearly completed in the admission of laymen into the General Conference to take part in the deliberations and legislation of that body, and prospectively, as all such measures have their logical results, into the annual conferences, to take part in transacting the business of those bodies. This was a measure well and proper to be done, and will add to the strength and conservatism of the Church, and thereby perpetuate for a longer time its great leading features. During this period it has scarcely occurred to any who have been busying themselves about what they have supposed to be a most vital measure—interesting to such a large and important element of the membership, and also greatly promoting the welfare of the Church itself—that two thirds of its members and three fourths of its piety had no place whatever in either the organic structure of the Church itself or in any of its incidental features or functions, excepting the fact of membership, or the right, as sinners saved, of membership in the Church of God. The Methodist Church, though in the history of its workings it has greatly enlarged the sphere of the religious activity of women, makes no legal provision for their labor as stewards, as class-leaders, as pastors or evangelists, nor as laborers in connection with the sick in hospitals and infirmaries; but rather, in its legal provisions, discriminates against them. In some departments of church work women are employed by the authorities of the Church, but this is merely incidentally, from custom and convenience, and not from legal provision. In the matter of making no legal provision for the work of women, and thus incorporating them into the economy of the Church, the Methodist body is in the same condition with other of the great Churches of our Protestant Christianity, which itself is substantially barren of all provisions for the recognition and labor of women. The abuses of the Catholic Church, arising out of the celibacy of the priesthood and the secluded and isolated condition of its orders of females, were so great, that our ancestors, in breaking loose from that Church, refused to incorporate any of these orders into their Churches. In this they may have committed a blunder which subsequent times, by other methods, may undertake to repair. In part, at least, to repair this blunder of our ancestors, it may be wise in our General Conference to consider whether the Methodist Church has an economy which can safely and successfully employ a portion of the great and vital female force found in every locality in legitimate work for the advancement of the Master's kingdom; whether its firmly organized economy of work and administrative authority will not safely and effectively allow women to be appointed stew-

and will add to the strength and conservation of the Church, and thereby perpetuate for a longer time its great leading features. During this period it has scarcely occurred to any who have been busying themselves about what they have supposed to be a more vital measure—interesting to such a large and important element of the membership, and also greatly promoting the welfare of the Church itself—that two thirds of its members and three fourths of its piety had no place whatever in either the organic structure of the Church itself or in any of its incidental features or functions, excepting the fact of membership, or the right, as sinners saved, of membership in the Church of God. The Methodist Church, though in the history of its workings it has greatly enlarged the sphere of the religious activity of women, makes no legal provision for their labor as stewards, as class-leaders, as pastors or evangelists, nor as laborers in connection with the sick in hospitals and infirmaries; but rather, in its legal provisions, discriminates against them. In some departments of church work women are employed by the authorities of the Church, but this is merely incidentally, from custom and convenience, and not from legal provision. In the matter of making no legal provision for the work of women, and thus incorporating them into the economy of the Church, the Methodist body is in the same condition with other of the great Churches of our Protestant Christianity, which itself is substantially barren of all provisions for the recognition and labor of women. The abuses of the Catholic Church, arising out of the celibacy of the priesthood and the secluded and isolated condition of its orders of females, were so great, that our ancestors, in breaking loose from that Church, refused to incorporate any of these orders into their Churches. In this they may have committed a blunder which subsequent times, by other methods, may undertake to repair. In part, at least, to repair this blunder of our ancestors, it may be wise in our General Conference to consider whether the Methodist Church has an economy which can safely and successfully employ a portion of the great and vital female force found in every locality in legitimate work for the advancement of the Master's kingdom; whether its firmly organized economy of work and administrative authority will not safely and effectively allow women to be appointed stewards, class-leaders, superintendents of Sunday-schools; whether the quarterly conferences may not have authority to appoint those who are qualified to perform pastoral work to labor in hospitals and asylums established under their authority; and whether the annual conferences may not appoint some of those grand women upon whom the baptism of eloquence has so strangely fallen to go forth as heralds of our beneficent agencies, arousing the Church, by their strange and eloquent appeals, into a grander zeal for the divine cause than has ever inspired her. We start in these suggestions no question as to a divine call to women to preach the Word, or of ordination to orders in the Church of Christ, but that of legitimate labor or work in the vineyard. May a woman work? May she be designated, under the authority of legal provision, to that end? Whether or not, scarcely a Church but holds within its fold women with higher qualifications for the kind of work needed to carry it forward than possessed by any of its men. Why not clothe the local church bodies with authority to avail themselves of this element of successful work? While measures of the preceding character may be valuable in extending the cause of Christ, and an important means to strengthen our own branch of the Christian Church in the judgment and confidence of the people, it would not be desirable to institute houses of retreat, or by any special ceremony devote this class of laborers to their work, but simply provide, in the order of the Church and under the oversight of its constituted authorities, for this class of laborers.

II. MEASURES PERTAINING TO LITERATURE.

It is not within the ability of any denomination of Christians to provide fully the necessary reading for all the communicants. The demand, under the universal education of the times, is too varied and great for this. We will, therefore, confine what we have to say under this head to the newspaper and periodical press. Our age, and our country during the present age, has witnessed a development of this agency for the instruction of the people and direction and control of public opinion that amazes us. As an agency in this direction, it has become so widespread and effective as to be regarded by many of the best observers as taking a place in advance of either the book or the pulpit. Be this as it may, it is one of the great instrumental-

ities of the times, and one to be employed and made effective in establishing the kingdom of Christ among men.

The Methodist Church, at a very early period in its history in this country, recognized this as one of the means to be employed in carrying forward her work, not only among her own communicants, but of advancing her cause with the public. And up to this hour she has found it so valuable an agency that it may be well to inquire if it cannot be invigorated, and made to take in new power as one of the working forces of the Church. This inquiry will embrace chiefly two points: first, Does our present denominational press come up to the measure and demand of the Church and community? and second, If it does not, by what means can it be brought up to this standard, and be made to meet present wants and subserve present necessities?

Regarding Methodist communities and people as in culture and means at least on an equal footing with those of other Churches and of the general public, it may be assumed that what will supply their wants, as far as its excellence is in question, will supply that of other people composing the great public; and nothing short of this is either respectable on our part or should satisfy us. Effeminacy, platitudes, pulpy stuff, or old quiddities, are not the things which will be either tolerated, or meet the necessities of the hour, or supply the wants of the people. As of old the scribe well instructed in the things of the kingdom of God brought forth things both new and old, so in the present period the newspaper as well as the pulpit, must recognize the same divine law of action, and bring forth the ever-recurring new, and when it brings the old, bring it clad in the new-made clothing, that it may be bright and comely, though old and having gray locks.

The leading journal of our Church, speaking of our denominational press, makes the following confession: "We may, without any simulated humility, confess that its increase in excellence has not kept pace with the increasing demands of the times;" and further, "Yielding to the pressure of circumstances, our publishers have failed to allow the normal development, and by their policy they have dwarfed the youth of the chief members of the Advocate family;" and we may add, have promoted such enterprises as the "Methodist," and the papers at ries of the times, and one to be employed and made effective in establishing the kingdom of Christ among men.

The Methodist Church, at a very early period in its history in this country, recognized this as one of the means to be employed in carrying forward her work, not only among her own communicants, but of advancing her cause with the public. And up to this hour she has found it so valuable an agency that it may be well to inquire if it cannot be invigorated, and made to take its true power as one of the working forces of the Church. This inquiry will embrace chiefly two points: first, Does our present denominational press come up to the measure and demand of the Church and community? and second, If it does not, by what means can it be brought up to this standard, and be made to meet present wants and subserve present necessities?

Regarding Methodist communities and people as in culture and means at least on an equal footing with those of other Churches and of the general public, it may be assumed that what will supply their wants, as far as its excellence is in question, will supply that of other people composing the great public; and nothing short of this is either creditable on our part or should satisfy us. Indifference, platitudes, pulpy stuff, or old qualities, are not the things which will be either tolerated, or meet the necessities of the hour, or supply the wants of the people. As of old the scribe well instructed in the things of the Kingdom of God brought forth things both new and old, so in the present period the newspaper as well as the pulpit, must recognize the same divine law of action, and bring forth the ever-recurring new, and when it brings the old, bring it clad in the new-made clothing, that it may be bright and comely, though old and having gray locks.

The leading journal of our Church, speaking of our denominational press, makes the following confession: "We may, without any stereotyped humility, confess that its increase in excellence has not kept pace with the increasing demands of the times;" and further, "Yielding to the pressure of circumstances, our publishers have failed to allow the normal development, and by their policy they have dwarfed the youth of the chief members of the *Advocate* family;" and we may add, have promoted such enterprises as the "Methodist," and the papers at

Cleveland and Indianapolis. It is no great confession this, as every body was aware of the fact before the confession was made. Sins known only to God and the sinner, confessed, are the confessions which have highest Gospel merit in them. Scarcely an agent for the past dozen years who has attempted to circulate our papers but has been embarrassed by the fact that our people had got ahead of the papers, and that, if the papers were received at all, they were received simply as denominational papers. These same agents have not been able to carry the journals into regions beyond. And they have in addition been humiliated by the fact that the journals of other Churches—and some of no Church, claiming to be pious—have in large numbers entered our fold; and in the case of the "Independent," often corrupted our members with its abominable preachments on the subject of marriage and divorce. Our journals need to be lifted into a broader, deeper, stronger life. They need to be freed from much of their dullness, from their little Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and Western correspondence, which abound in items of but little interest, and at most should be compressed into a few lines; freed from the endless platitudes on Methodism, and Wesleyanism, and sanctification, and self-glorification in personal items; from nearly all obituary notices; from district ministerial notices, presiding elder notices, marriage and many other notices, and most of the pulpy stuff which can only minister to unorganized and disorganized tastes and stomachs, and should never be taken into the account when providing food to sustain and promote the life of the Church of God. Our papers need more biblical exposition and criticism; more theology, more literature, more science and art; a more frank and full dealing with the condition of the country in its sphere of politics, business, and of public law; more upon the labor and toils of the people in the tug of life; a better serving of the family and school; and a more daring war on evil of all forms and in all places; and in addition, an amount of news and items sufficient for reasonable information, in connection with good morals. This may be putting the standard of the newspaper up to a very high mark. But in view of the fact that it is one of the great educators of the people, and a potent instrumentality in directing the opinion and action of the masses, is the standard too high? and should

any thing lower be aimed at by a great Church? and should not this good be attained, if possible?

This brings us to the inquiry, By what means can this ultimate be approximated and finally attained? The means to this end are few and easily named: first, money; second, experience; third, intellect, culture, knowledge; fourth, heart, or moral and spiritual force—and all these several elements brought into requisition and applied to secure the end. No great thing was ever produced without the adequate means. This holds in regard to religious papers as to every thing else. It is as great folly to expect newspapers such as are a necessity in the household and a power in the realm, without the proper elements and conditions, as for a builder to erect the grand cathedral without the architectural genius and all the other incidents to a great work of art.

As to money, a simple consolidation of the subscription lists of the "Christian," "Northern," and "Pittsburgh" Advocates, and "Zion's Herald," could it be added, would give the requisite money for a paper of such size and quality of material as would meet the requisition and gladden the heart of those who desire to see such papers as ought to be printed by a great Church. A like consolidation of the lists of the "Western," "North-western," and "St. Louis," with the "Cleveland" and "Indianapolis," could they be added, would be the basis of a like amount of capital for a second great journal. Then, with proper editorial corps, and a spirit of enterprise on their part, and of liberality on the part of agents and book committees as to appropriations to secure material for these journals, the end might be approached. It is possible that the Methodist Church has culture, talent, knowledge, spiritual and moral power, and executive ability to the requisite extent of creating the leading religious journals of the world. If she has not, she ought to work and pray for it, that in this she may have the pre-eminence.

Can this consolidation be effected? Not easily. The older men, who are yet in authority, live in the age which preceded railroad centralization, and modern facilities for intercommunication, and cannot very easily accommodate their action to these facts. And then there would be the strife of the cities and the clans: New York, Boston, Syracuse, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis, and the clans which may center

in these places respectively, would not be willing to yield the thousandth part of an inch unless their own locality could be served. But what care the rural clergy, and what care the great people, as to where the printing is done, so that they are served with papers such as their families and Churches and communities require? Should not the clans be satisfied with offices of issue in such localities as Syracuse, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Cincinnati, or Chicago, and let the editing and printing take place where it can be done to greatest advantage?

III. MEASURES PERTAINING TO THE ITINERANCY.

The great overmastering fact of Methodism has been its itinerancy; its itinerant episcopacy, its itinerant presiding eldership, and its itinerant pastorate, regular, orderly, well adjusted, and mainly efficient. In analyzing Methodism in regard to its elements of success, while many things appear and are taken into the account as playing their part in securing its incomparable success, this one, beyond question, has been the great element, and the one without which all other would have availed but comparatively little. With a well-adjusted itinerancy New England Congregationalism would to-day carry sway in this land: but without this it can scarcely, in the religious sphere, claim to be a fourth-rate power. Instead of spreading itself over the land, and occupying its waste places, it has scarcely gone out of New England, and may be regarded a comparative failure. The prestige of Plymouth rock, the advantages of an educated ministry, and the backing of the great colleges and universities, harnessed on so weak a church government, have availed comparatively but little. The reason is obvious. No executive power has animated and directed its church action. Independent boulders or brick will not form the building without the hand and skill of the architect. Mere squatter sovereignty is not apt to develop the highest form of civilized government. Nor will Congregational churchism make other than very slow advancement across a continent or round the world.

If itinerancy has been the great efficient agency of Methodism, what can, what shall be done to keep it unimpaired, and, if possible, add to its vigor? What! If it is left unimpaired, two or three things are necessary. First, the episcopacy and in these places respectively, would not be willing to yield the thousandth part of an inch unless their own locality could be served. But what care the rural clergy, and what care the great people, as to where the printing is done, so that they are served with papers such as their families and Churches and communities require? Should not the sharp be satisfied with offices of issue in such localities—say Boston, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Cincinnati, or Chicago, and let the editing and printing take place where it can be done to greatest advantage?

III. Measures Pertaining to the Itinerancy.

The great overmastering fact of Methodism has been its itinerancy; its itinerant episcopacy, its itinerant presiding eldership, and its itinerant pastorate, regular, orderly, well adjusted, and mainly efficient. In analyzing Methodism in regard to its elements of success, while many things appear and are taken into the account as playing their part in securing its incomparable success, this one, beyond question, has been the great element, and the one without which all other would have availed but comparatively little. With a well-adjusted itinerancy New England Congregationalism would to-day carry sway in this land; but without this it can scarcely, in the religious sphere, claim to be a fourth-rate power. Instead of spreading itself over the land, and occupying its waste places, it has scarcely gone out of New England, and may be regarded a comparative failure. The prestige of Plymouth rock, the advantages of an educated ministry, and the backing of the great colleges and universities, harnessed on so weak a church government, have availed comparatively but little. The reason is obvious. No executive power has animated and directed its church action. Independent boulders or brick will not form the building without the hand and skill of the architect. Mere squatter sovereignty is not apt to develop the highest form of civilized government. Nor will Congregational churchism make other than very slow advancement across a continent, or round the world.

If itinerancy has been the great efficient agency of Methodism, what now, what shall be done to keep it unimpaired, and, if possible, add to its vigor? What? If it is left unimpaired, two or three things are necessary. First, the episcopacy and presiding eldership (now and always the right hand of episcopal efficiency and success) must be left without serious modification. Episcopal districts for administration and episcopal residences will amount to but little, and may incumber the action of the board. These districts and fixed authoritive residences may make a stride in the direction of diocesanism, and, what might be worse, sectionalism. As to the charge that the presiding eldership has not been officered by men of commanding strength and fine preaching ability, an examination of the facts might fail to sustain any thing more than that the charge came from the smaller men in the stations and certain garrulous editors. Second, the strong tendency manifested in the great centers and strong Churches of the East, and a few sections in the West, toward that weakest of all forms of church government, Congregationalism, must be abandoned or checked, and the itinerant material must be invigorated. That the tendency to Congregationalism has shown itself in very considerable strength no observer for a moment will doubt. Church committees and ministers in very many localities go through the process of contract for supply, salary, and service, and expect the bishop and his cabinet, as a matter of *right*, to have their little preliminary and selfish arrangement—one disregarding the rights and interests of the general partnership—sanctioned. And it is these invaders upon our grand old economy who decry the eldership, and war on the episcopacy, when not gratified in their desires. An episcopacy of itself cannot keep in existence an itinerant ministry. It will lack the information necessary to make the appointments suitably. The episcopacy, ministry, and people cannot keep up successfully an itinerancy, as the element of selfishness would play too great a part in making the appointments, if left to be made in this way. Chairmanships in Wesleyanism and Canadian Methodism have always been comparatively inefficient. The Wesleyan body has not, since the days of Wesley, manifested the vigor that it did when he was the primate, and the appointments were made by himself. Canadian Methodism, under its chairmanships and committees, does not begin to compare in vigor with New York Methodism. Here are fair tests of the two forms of itinerancy. Success in winning souls, in confirming believers, in multiplying means, in unfolding and sustaining presiding eldership (now and always the right hand of episcopal efficiency and success) must be left without serious modification. Episcopal districts for administration and episcopal residences will amount to but little, and may encumber the action of the board. These districts and fixed authoritive residences may make a stride in the direction of diocesanism, and, what might be worse, sectionalism. As to the charge that the presiding eldership has not been officered by men of commanding strength and fine preaching ability, an examination of the facts might fail to sustain any thing more than that the charge came from the smaller men in the stations and certain garrulous editors. Second, the strong tendency manifested in the great centers and strong Churches of the East, and a few sections in the West, toward that weakest of all forms of church government, Congregationalism, must be abandoned or checked, and the itinerant material must be invigorated. That the tendency to Congregationalism has shown itself in very considerable strength no observer for a moment will doubt. Church committees and ministers in very many localities go through the process of contract for supply, salary, and service, and expect the bishop and his cabinet, as a matter of right, to base their little preliminary and selfish arrangement—one disregarding the rights and interests of the general pastorship—sanctioned. And it is these invaders upon our grand old economy who decry the eldership, and war on the episcopacy, when not gratified in their desires. An episcopacy of itself cannot keep in existence an itinerant ministry. It will lack the information necessary to make the appointments suitably. The episcopacy, ministry, and people cannot keep up successfully an itinerancy, as the element of selfishness would play too great a part in making the appointments, if left to be made in this way. Chairmanships in Wesleyanism and Canadian Methodism have always been comparatively inefficient. The Wesleyan body has not, since the days of Wesley, manifested the vigor that it did when he was the princeps, and the appointments were made by himself. Canadian Methodism, under its chairmanships and committees, does not begin to compare in vigor with New York Methodism. Here are fair tests of the two forms of itinerancy: Success in winning souls, in multiplying believers, in multiplying means, in unfolding and enlarging agencies to establish the kingdom of God, is a test of the value of forms of church government, as well as it is of a call of God to the Christian ministry. By what method the tendency to Congregationalism in our great Churches and wealthy societies can be checked is not clear. Possibly something can be hoped from patriotism. By bringing lay-representation into the annual conferences, where laymen will hold contact and communion with laymen, and the laymen of the small church be found as intelligent and as appreciative of good ministers as the laymen of the great churches, and especially by the nearness with which the laymen will be brought to the actual details in making the appointments, and the solicitude and difficulty in reaching just conclusions, they may become impressed with a more favorable judgment of the wisdom of the old arrangement, and consequently modify the prevalent spirit of meddling with work which properly belongs to others, and which can be more successfully done by those upon whom the responsibility rests than by any other parties whomsoever. If this tendency is not checked and abandoned, the probability is that the Methodist Church will retrograde into the inefficient, irregular, ministerial heart-breaking itinerancy practiced by nearly all other Protestant bodies in this land: when Methodism will present the spectacle seen elsewhere of hundreds of churches without a minister, and hundreds of willing and capable ministers without a church, and the waste places uncared for. May God rain a little brimstone and fire on a few of the high places and high ones in our Zion rather! Second, Methodism has always had a wonderful facility in creating ministers, and consequently in supplying her Churches. This facility has often sent a man into the field of labor as a minister in a month, six months, or a year after conversion; and with the energetic, halleluia spirit which has always animated the body, it is not surprising if numerous mistakes have been made, and often the wrong men have been thrust out.

The fact that to-day full a seventh of all the ministers in the traveling connection are on the superannuated and supernumerary lists would indicate this statement. Men whose incapacity even the two years' probation failed to correct, retire to these lists, and so load them down that honorable and sensitive men, who are justly entitled to the position, and who have merit and agencies to establish the kingdom of God, is a test of the value of forms of church government, as well as it is of a call of God to the Christian ministry. By what method the tendency to Congregationalism in our great Churches and wealthy societies can be checked is not clear. Possibly something may be hoped from lay-representation. By bringing lay-representation into the annual conferences, where laymen will hold contact and communion with laymen, and the laymen of the small church be found as intelligent and as appreciative of good ministers as the laymen of the great churches, and especially by the nearness with which the laymen will be brought to the actual details in making the appointments, and the solicitude and difficulty in reaching just conclusions, they may become impressed with a more favorable judgment of the wisdom of the old arrangement, and consequently modify the prevalent spirit of meddling with work which properly belongs to others, and which can be more successfully done by those upon whom the responsibility rests than by any other parties whomsoever. If this tendency is not checked and abandoned, the probability is that the Methodist Church will retrograde into the inefficient, irregular, ministerial heart-breaking itinerancy practiced by nearly all other Protestant bodies in this land: when Methodism will present the spectacle seen elsewhere of hundreds of churches without a minister, and hundreds of willing and capable ministers without a church, and the waste places uncared for. May God rain a little brimstone and fire on a few of the high places and high ones in our Zion rather! Second, Methodism has always had a wonderful facility in creating ministers, and consequently in supplying her Churches. This facility has often sent a man into the field of labor as a minister in a month, six months, or a year after conversion; and with the energetic, hallelujah spirit which has always animated the body, it is not surprising if numerous mistakes have been made, and often the wrong men have been thrust out.

The fact that to-day full a seventh of all the ministers in the travelling connection are on the superannuated and supernumerary lists would indicate this statement. Men whose incapacity even the two years' probation failed to correct, going to these lists, and so load them down that honorable and sensitive men, who are justly entitled to the position, and who have merit and scars, feel dishonored in their position and relations. And not only this, but many others remain on the active lists who are of no account, but are hinderances to the work—men without the intellect, the culture, the religion, or the zeal to make them accepatble ministers of Christ. For the truth of this strong statement we appeal to every bishop, to every presiding elder, and to the great body of ministers themselves. This fact has come from the haste with which ministers in our Church have been created, and the cumbersome methods to get rid of inefficient and worthless men; and also tameness in annual conferences in applying the present methods of relief. It is little short of crime to impose upon a people a worthless man for their minister, and thereby pension him upon their bounty. It is certainly a crime after the fact of worthlessness is known. The present method of relieving the Church of this class of men is too cumbersome, and has failed to answer the end. The Church, which has opened so wide the gates to bring men into the ministry, should provide a readier door out. What is suggested instead of the present method of trial for this class of men, now or hereafter incumbering the Church, is a *board of retirement* in connection with the Annual Conferences. Let these boards be constituted of the substantial and working clergymen, with full power to determine all cases submitted to them by either the bishop and his cabinet, or the conference itself. If the bishop cannot station a man, let his case go to this board, and let them examine it, and say what course the case shall take. If a minister desires a supernumerary or superannuated relation, let the board examine the case, and judge if it is proper for him to have it. Rather than submit to an examination some might choose to retire to the local ranks, to which, from inefficiency, of right they belong. As ministers are apt to deal justly with each other when judging of character, it is probable that the itinerant material would thus soon gain an efficiency which nothing else could impart. Work, or come to judgment, would be the motto. This would be better than colleges, biblical training schools, the prayers of the people, or large salaries. Work, or go into less efficient communions, as we are intending to carry our banner across the world, and have no use for lazy warriors.

In connection with this process of purification of the ranks ears, feel dishonored in their position and relations. And not only this, but many others remain on the active lists who are of no account, but are hinderances to the work—men without the intellect, the culture, the religion, or the zeal to make them acceptable ministers of Christ. For the truth of this strong statement we appeal to every bishop, to every presiding elder, and to the great body of ministers themselves. This fact has come from the haste with which ministers in our Church have been created, and the cumbersome methods to get rid of inefficient and worthless men; and also tenderness in annual conferences in applying the present methods of relief. It is little short of crime to impose upon a people a worthless man for their minister, and thereby pension him upon their bounty. It is certainly a crime after the fact of worthlessness is known. The present method of relieving the Church of this class of men is too cumbersome, and has failed to answer the end. The Church, which has opened so wide the gates to bring men into the ministry, should provide a readier door out. What is suggested instead of the present method of trial for this class of men, now or hereafter incumbering the Church, is a *board of retirement* in connection with the Annual Conferences. Let these boards be constituted of the substantial and working clergymen, with full power to determine all cases submitted to them by either the bishop and his cabinet, or the conference itself. If the bishop cannot station a man, let his case go to the board, and let them examine it, and say what course the case shall take. If a minister desires a superannuary or supernumerated relation, let the board examine the case, and judge if it is proper for him to have it. Rather than submit to an examination some might choose to retire to the local ranks, to which, from inefficiency, of right they belong. As ministers are apt to deal justly with each other when judging of character, it is probable that the itinerant material would thus soon gain an efficiency which nothing else could impart. Work, or come to judgment, would be the motto. This would be better than colleges, biblical training schools, the prayers of the people, or large salaries. Work, or go into less efficient communities, as we are intending to carry our banner across the world, and have no use for lazy warriors.

In connection with this process of purification of the ranks of our itinerancy, the law regulating the superannuated relation ought to undergo a revision. That relation should not be one of charity, but of heroism and honor, and also embrace in it the insurance element. The reward to fidelity in the ministry ought to be graduated by the service rendered. The relation itself should not be as easily accessible as at present, none being allowed to gain it until a number of years of service had transpired. After the relation is granted, a *pro rata*, on the basis of the years of service rendered, would insure in the *evening* the heroic man, whose ministry is his life-work, against the wolf coming in at the door.

IV. MEASURES PERTAINING TO PROPERTY.

The Methodist Church has in its colleges, institutes, seminary buildings, churches, ministers' houses, and book establishments, property amounting to seventy millions of dollars. This property is increasing at the rate of two or three millions annually, and will soon amount to a hundred millions. In the coming General Conference will be many of our leading laymen, and men of fine judgment and business ability. Cannot they devise a measure by which this large amount of property can insure itself, and at a premium greatly below that at present paid? If this can be done, it will be an easy matter to restore a burned church, a minister's house, or college; and in case of a similar calamity to that of Chicago overtaking another of our cities, the ruined churches could easily be lifted from their ashes.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, January, 1872. (Hartford, Conn.)—1. The Church and the Laboring Classes. 2. Scientific Speculation *vs.* Theological Interpretation. 3. Remarks on the American Church. 4. Deaconesses. 5. Modern Thought in its Relation to the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. 6. Munificence in Giving a Present Need of the Times. 7. The Changes in England during Half a Century. 8. Regeneration in Baptism. 9. The Analysis of the Sunbeam.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Attitude of the Christian Teacher in Respect to Science. 2. The Rational and the Supernatural. 3. The Religious Basis of Human Government. 4. Is Truth an Instrument in Regeneration? 5. Pascal. 6. Exegesis of Proverbs xxiii, 26. 7. Exegetical Studies.

of our itinerancy, the law regulating the superannuated relation ought to undergo a revision. That relation should not be one of charity, but of heroism and honor, and also embrace in it the insurance element. The reward to fidelity in the ministry ought to be graduated by the service rendered. The relation itself should not be so easily accessible as at present, none being allowed to gain it until a number of years of service had transpired. After the relation is granted, a per cent., on the basis of the years of service rendered, would insure to the closing the heroic man, whose ministry is his life-work, against the wolf coming in at the door.

IV. Methodist Protection to Property.

The Methodist Church has in its colleges, institutes, seminary buildings, churches, ministers' houses, and book establishments, property amounting to seventy millions of dollars. This property is increasing at the rate of two or three millions annually, and will soon amount to a hundred millions. In the coming General Conference will be many of our leading laymen, and men of fine judgment and business ability. Cannot they devise a measure by which this large amount of property can insure itself, and at a premium greatly below that at present paid? If this can be done, it will be an easy matter to restore a burned church, a minister's house, or college; and in case of a similar calamity to that of Chicago overtaking another of our cities, the ruined churches could easily be lifted from their ashes.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, January, 1872. (Protestant Epis.)—1. The Church and the Lutheran Church. 2. Scientific Speculation *vs.* Theological Inspiration. 3. Remarks on the American Church. 4. [illegible]. 5. Modern Thought in its Relation to the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. 6. [illegible] in Giving a Present Sketch of the Times. 7. The [illegible] in [illegible] Half a Century. 8. [illegible] in [illegible]. 9. The Analysis of the [illegible].

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Attitude of the Christian Teacher in Respect to Science. 2. The Talmud and the [illegible]. 3. The Religious Basis of Human Government. 4. Is Faith an Antecedent to Regeneration? 5. Prayer. 6. Exegesis of Proverbs xxii, 26. 7. Biblical Studies.

Bibliotheca Sacra, and Theological Eclectic, January, 1872. (Andover, Mass.)—1. The Physical Basis of our Spiritual Language. 2. English Eloquence and Debate. 3. Revelation and Inspiration. 4. The Weekly Sabbath. 5. The Organic and Visible Manifestation of Christ's Kingdom, and the Human Agency in its Advancement. 6. The Three Fundamental Methods of Preaching—The Public Reading of Sermons, and the Preaching of them Memoriter.

Mercersburg Review, January, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Germanic and Latin Races. 2. A University or a Gymnasium? 3. Original Sin. 4. Rev. Dr. Krauth's Conservative Reformation. 5. Theory of Revivals. 6. The Circumcision of Christ. 7. The Elements and Purposes of the Parable. 8. Our Educational Policy.

North American Review, January, 1872. (Boston.)—1. Poor-Law Administration in New England. 2. American Criticism: its Difficulties and Prospects. 3. Oratory and Journalism. 4. Thomas Watson the Poet. 5. Harvard College. 1786–87. 6. The Butler Canvass.

Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review, (New Series,) January, 1872. (New York.)—1. The Variable and the Constant in Christian Apology. 2. The Theology for our Age and Country. 3. The Plymouth Brethren. 4. The Wine Question in the Light of the Law of Love. 5. Total Abstinence and its Scriptural Basis. 6. Paris under the Commune. 7. Jowett's Plato. 8. Ezra, the Model of the Biblical Divine.

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, January, 1872. (Gettysburg.)—1. Dynamics of Success. 2. Lessons of the Franco-Prussian War. 3. The Theological Exegesis of the Holy Scriptures. 4. Chronology of the Roman Emperors. 5. Dr. Krauth's Metaphysics of the Lord's Supper. 6. New Phases of the Argument for Immortality. 7. The Right to the Name Lutheran.

Theological Medium, A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, January, 1872. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Causality and the Will. 2. Nature of Conscience. 3. The Pulpit. 4. God's Liberalism. 5. The Christian Rule Governing Popular Amusements. 6. Spiritual Telegraphy. 7. A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. 8. The Unpardonable Sin. 9. Practical Theology.

Universalist Quarterly, January, 1872. (Boston.)—1. The Conditions of Professional Success. 2. Clement of Rome. 3. Modern Utilitarianism. 4. John Woolman's Journal. 5. Caleb Rich. 6. Mediævalism and Nature. 7. The Doctrine of Annihilation.

English Reviews.

London Quarterly Review, January, 1872. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Drama in England. 2. The Life and Writings of John Hookham Frere. 3. The Latest Development of Literary Poetry. 4. The Life and Philosophy of Bishop Berkeley. 5. The Bank of England and the Money Market. 6. Forster's Life of Dickens. 7. A Key to the Narrative of the Four Gospels. 8. Sir Henry Holland's Recollections. 9. Marco Polo, and Travels in his Footsteps. 10. Primary Education in Ireland. 11. The Proletariat on a False Scent.

Westminster Review, January, 1872. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Greek Tragedy and Euripides. 2. The Geographical Distribution of Animals and Plants. 3. The Political Disabilities of Women. 4. The First Earl of Shaftesbury. 5. The Development of Belief. 6. The Government and the Education Act. 7. A Theory of Wages.

British Quarterly, January, 1872. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Lanfrey's Napoleon the First. 2. Beethoven. 3. An English Interior in the Seventeenth Century. 4. Catullus and his Translators. 5. Mohammed. 6. The Speaker's Commentary. 7. The Working of the Education Act. 8. Last Words on the Ballot Question.

The article on Mohammed concedes to the great Arabian a true divine mission, which he faithfully fulfilled until he comes

fairly in contact with the truths of Christianity, and should have embraced them. He rejected them, and from that time a demoralization commenced in his character and career.

The article is based on a very interesting DEFENSE OF MOHAMMEDANISM in England, by Syed Ahmed Khan Bahador, of which the following account is given :—

"The appearance in the English tongue of a defense of the Mohammedan religion from the hand of one who, on the one hand, claims a lineal descent from the Prophet, and on the other hand, has been enrolled in an English order of knighthood, is a mark of the drawing together of East and West which would have seemed impossible a generation or two back. And it marks that drawing together in its best form. It is something new for a professor of Islam, evidently devout and learned according to his own standard, to stand forth and challenge European and Christian thinkers on their own ground. It is a sign of a new spirit among thoughtful Mohammedans, when a writer of their religion no longer shuts himself up within the old barriers of his exclusive creed. The bidding of his Prophet and forefather to make ceaseless war upon the Infidel is carried out by Syed Ahmed Khan in a new shape. The faith can no longer be spread over new realms at the sword's point; but new fields of conflict, and therefore of possible triumph, are laid open. It is to the credit of the followers of Islam if they are learning, as the author of this book clearly has learned, that it is a false policy for a system which can no longer spread itself by temporal weapons to withdraw itself into sullen isolation. Our Syed takes a far worthier course, and one which shows a far truer faith in his own religion, by trying to show that that religion need not shun the light, but that it dares to stand forth and meet other systems face to face on the arena of free inquiry. The mutual contempt of Christian and Moslem has been largely the result of mutual ignorance. It has largely been the result of each side seeing the other in its worst form. And the fashion of glorifying one particular Mohammedan power, which has prevailed by fits and starts for some years, as it certainly does not rise out of any deep knowledge of Islam and its history, is not likely to tend to any fair and reasonable interchange of ideas between Mohammedans and Christians. Such a book as that of Syed fairly in contact with the truths of Christianity, and should have embraced them. He rejected them, and from that time a demoralization commenced in his character and career.

The article is based on a very interesting Defence of Mohammedanism in England, by Syed Ahmed Khan Bahador, of which the following account is given :—

"The appearance in the English tongue of a defence of the Mohammedan religion from the hand of one who, on the one hand, claims a lineal descent from the Prophet, and on the other hand, has been enrolled in an English order of knighthood, is a mark of the drawing together of East and West which would have seemed impossible a generation or two back. And it marks that drawing together in its best form. It is something new for a professor of Islam, evidently devout and learned according to his own standard, to stand forth and challenge European and Christian thinkers on their own ground. It is a sign of a new spirit among thoughtful Mohammedans, when a writer of their religion no longer shuts himself up within the old barriers of his exclusive creed. The bidding of his Prophet and forefather to make ceaseless war upon the Infidel is carried out by Syed Ahmed Khan in a new shape. The faith can no longer be spread over new realms at the sword's point; but new fields of conflict, and therefore of possible triumph, are laid open. It is to the credit of the followers of Islam if they are learning, as the author of this book clearly has learned, that it is a false policy for a system which can no longer spread itself by temporal weapons to withdraw itself into sullen isolation. Our Syed takes a far worthier course, and one which shows a far truer faith in his own religion, by trying to show that that religion need not shun the light, but that it dares to stand forth and meet other systems face to face on the arena of free inquiry. The mutual contempt of Christian and Moslem has been largely the result of mutual ignorance. It has largely been the result of each side seeing the other in its worst form. And the fashion of glorifying one particular Mohammedan people, which has prevailed by fits and starts for some years, as it certainly does not rise out of any deep knowledge of Islam and its history, is not likely to tend to any fair and reasonable interchange of ideas between Mohammedans and Christians. Such a book as that of Syed

Ahmed opens to us a new world. Few Europeans have any notion of the vast mass of theological literature which has been gathered together by Mohammedan divines—of the vast mass of commentaries of which the Koran has become the center. It is possible that in some cases Western controversialists might find their antagonists in the East somewhat stronger than they might expect. But at all events they may be surprised at finding the war carried into their own country. Syed Ahmed is evidently not afraid of meeting either Christian divines or European scholars on their own ground. He is certainly not free from that contempt for the Infidel which seems inherent in the Moslem character, and which is, we suppose, specially becoming in a descendant of the Prophet. The Syed is ready to acknowledge, and to acknowledge with thankfulness, any instances where his great forefather has received favorable, or even just, dealing at the hands of European writers. Still, on the whole, he looks down on his Christian antagonists: and he looks down on them with a sort of contemptuous pity as his intellectual inferiors, as men less thoughtful and less well-informed than himself. Such a state of mind is certainly not the best for engaging in controversy; but on the other hand, it is certainly not the worst. Syed Ahmed, as we hold, overrates his own knowledge and his own powers of reasoning, as compared with those of his Christian opponents. But by so doing he admits that the question is a matter for reason and inquiry; and, after all, our Mohammedan controversialist does not treat Christians as a body nearly so badly as Christians of different sects are often in the habit of treating one another."—Pp. 51, 52.

The following passages furnish a view of the proofs of MOHAMMEDANISM FROM PROPHECY:—

"Yet, while Mohammed thus cast aside all thoughts of amalgamation with Judaism and Christianity, and fell back on the supposed earlier faith of Abraham, he never ceased to proclaim that Moses and Jesus were the prophets of two successive divine dispensations, and that the sacred books of their respective followers were two successive revelations of the divine will. Those books, as they existed in his time, were, in his view, utterly corrupted, but, in their original purity, they had been the word of God, no less than his own Koran. It was there-

fore natural that he should seek to show that these earlier revelations pointed to himself as a teacher who was still to come. As the Christians held that their prophet was pointed out and foretold in the writings of the Jewish dispensation, so it might be expected that Mohammed himself would be pointed out and foretold in the writings of the Christian dispensation. In a well-known passage of the Koran, Mohammed himself affirms that Jesus had prophesied of him by the name of Ahmed, a name radically the same as Mohammed or Mohammet. There can be little doubt, as has been often shown, that this idea arose from some confusion or corruption of the text of the passage where Christ promises the coming of the Paraclete. Another passage which has been often and with real ingenuity held to refer to Mohammed, is the passage of Isaiah which speaks of a 'chariot of asses and a chariot of camels,' more accurately, it would seem, 'a rider on an ass and a rider on a camel.' Syed Ahmed has a whole essay, an essay showing a good deal of ingenuity, on the prophecies of Mohammed contained in the Old and New Testament. The original promise to Ishmael is pressed into the service; if, as Christian writers hold, the promise made to Isaac was not wholly temporal, but contained a promise of spiritual blessings also, then the analogous promise to Ishmael should also be held to take in the spiritual blessings granted to the race of Ishmael by Mohammed coming of his stock. Mohammed, again, is the prophet whom the Lord was to raise up to the Israelites from among their brethren like unto Moses. For we are expressly told that in Israel itself there never arose another prophet like unto Moses. The brethren, therefore, spoken of, must be the brethren of the stock of Ishmael, and the prophet who was to be the peer of the lawgiver of the Hebrews can be no other than the prophet who came to be the lawgiver of the Arabs. We read again that the Lord came from Sinai, and shined forth from Paran. He came from Sinai with Moses, and shined forth from Paran—in our Syed's geography the mountain of Mecca—with Mohammed. Lastly, the Prophet's own name is found both in the Song of Solomon and the prophet Haggai. The 'altogether lovely' of the one passage, the 'desire of all nations' of the other, contain in the original the Arabian prophet's very name. Mohammed is again discerned when the Pharisees ask of John the Baptist fore natural that he should seek to show that those earlier revelations pointed to himself as a teacher who was still to come. As the Christians held that their prophet was pointed out and foretold in the writings of the Jewish dispensation, so it might be expected that Mohammed himself would be pointed out and foretold in the writings of the Christian dispensation. In a well-known passage of the Koran, Mohammed himself affirms that Jesus had prophesied of him by the name of Ahmed, a name radically the same as Mohammed or Mohammet. There can be little doubt, as has been often shown, that this idea arose from some confusion or corruption of the text of the passage where Christ promises the coming of the Paraclete. Another passage which has been often and with real ingenuity held to refer to Mohammed, is the passage of Isaiah which speaks of a 'chariot of asses and a chariot of camels,' more accurately, it would seem, 'a rider on an ass and a rider on a camel.' Syed Ahmed has a whole essay, an essay showing a good deal of ingenuity, on the prophecies of Mohammed contained in the Old and New Testament. The original promise to Ishmael is pressed into the service; if, as Christian writers hold, the promise made to Isaac was not wholly temporal, but contained a promise of spiritual blessings also, then the analogous promise to Ishmael should also be held to take in the spiritual blessings granted to the race of Ishmael by Mohammed coming of his stock. Mohammed, again, is the prophet whom the Lord was to raise up to the Israelites from among their brethren like unto Moses. For we are expressly told that in Israel itself there never arose another prophet like unto Moses. The brethren, therefore, spoken of, must be the brethren of the stock of Ishmael, and the prophet who was to be the peer of the lawgiver of the Hebrews can be no other than the prophet who came to be the lawgiver of the Arabs. We read again that the Lord came from Sinai, and shined forth from Paran. He came from Sinai with Moses, and shined forth from Paran—in our Syed's geography the mountain of Mecca—with Mohammed. Lastly, the Prophet's own name is found both in the Song of Solomon and the prophet Haggai. The 'altogether lovely' of the one passage, the 'desire of all nations' of the other, contain in the original the Arabian prophet's very name. Mohammed is again discerned when the Pharisees ask of John the Bapwhether he is Christ, or Elias, or that Prophet. The prophet who is thus distinguished from Christ and Elias can be no other than Mohammed. Lastly, the farewell words of Christ to his disciples to abide in the city of Jerusalem until endowed with power from on high does not refer to the coming of the Holy Ghost, which, it is argued, had no reference to a dwelling at Jerusalem, but referred to the reverence which was to be shown to Jerusalem as the holy place and center of Christian devotion till the reverence once paid to Jerusalem should be transferred to Mecca."—Pp. 64, 65.

In the article on the Speaker's Commentary we find the following professed disproof of the MESSIANIC APPLICATION OF THE SHILOH:—

"In the Commentary on Gen. xlix, 10, we have one of the many instances in which the writers are arguing from a foregone conclusion. On the phrase rendered, in the authorized version, 'until Shiloh come,' Dr. Harold Browne makes the startling assertion, 'The only two admissible interpretations of Shiloh are, that the word is (1) a proper name, meaning "the Peace-maker," "the Prince of Peace," or, (2) according to the almost unanimous consent of the versions and Targums, "He whose right it is." All the Targums add the name of Messiah, and all the more ancient Jews held it to be an undoubted prophecy of Messiah.' And in the excursus on the word Shiloh at the end of the chapter, the Bishop winds up by saying that 'the only arguments of any weight against the Messianic character of the prophecy, except of course a denial that prophecy is possible at all, seem to be the following: 1. The patriarchal age had no anticipation of a personal Messiah, though there may have been some dim hope of a future deliverance; and, 2. The New Testament does not cite this as a prediction of Christ.' That these two arguments only should have been known to the learned prelate is a matter of surprise, when every page of his Commentary displays such a vast amount of reading. The fact is, that there are many and weighty arguments against the rendering, 'until Shiloh come,' while there is only one reason for it, namely, Jewish tradition, which, as we shall presently see, is based upon a very objectionable canon of exegesis.

"The arguments against the present rendering, that is, 'until Shiloh come,' are as follows: 1. The word *Shiloh* occurs no less whether he is Christ, or Elias, or that Prophet. The prophet who is thus distinguished from Christ and Elias can be no other than Mohammed. Lastly, the farewell words of Christ to his disciples to abide in the city of Jerusalem until endued with power from on high does not refer to the coming of the Holy Ghost, which, it is argued, had no reference to a dwelling at Jerusalem, but referred to the reverence which was to be shown to Jerusalem as the holy place and centre of Christian devotion till the reverence once paid to Jerusalem should be transferred to Mecca."—Pp. 64, 65.

In the article on the Speaker's Commentary we find the following professed disproof of the MESSIANIC APPLICATION OF THE SHILOH:—

"In the Commentary on Gen. xlix, 10, we have one of the many instances in which the writers are arguing from a foregone conclusion. On the phrase rendered, in the authorized version, 'until Shiloh come,' Dr. Harold Browne makes the startling assertion, 'The only two admissible interpretations of Shiloh are, that the word is (1) a proper name, meaning "the Peace-maker," "the Prince of Peace," or, (2) according to the almost unanimous consent of the versions and Targums, "He whose right it is." All the Targums add the name of Messiah, and all the more ancient Jews held it to be an undoubted prophecy of Messiah.' And in the excursus on the word Shiloh at the end of the chapter, the Bishop winds up by saying that 'the only arguments of any weight against the Messianic character of the prophecy, except of course a denial that prophecy is possible at all, seem to be the following: 1. The patriarchal age had no anticipation of a personal Messiah, though there may have been some dim hope of a future deliverance; and, 2. The New Testament does not cite this as a prediction of Christ.' That these two arguments only should have been known to the learned prelate is a matter of surprise, when every page of his Commentary displays such a vast amount of reading. The fact is, that there are many and weighty arguments against the rendering, 'until Shiloh come,' while there is only one reason for it, namely, Jewish tradition, which, as we shall presently see, is based upon a very objectionable canon of exegesis.

"The arguments against the present rendering, that is, 'until Shiloh come,' are as follows: 1. The word *Shiloh* occurs no less than thirty-three times in the Hebrew Scriptures (Gen. xlix, 10. Josh. xviii, 1, 8, 9, 10; xix, 51; xxi, 2; xxii, 9, 12. Judges xviii, 31; xxi, 12; xix, 21, 21. 1 Sam. i, 3, 9, 24; ii, 14; iii, 21, 21; iv, 3, 4, 12; xiv, 3. 1 Kings ii, 27; xiv, 2, 4. Jer. vii, 12, 14; xxvi, 6, 9; xli, 5. Psa. lxxviii, 60,) and invariably denotes *the town Shiloh.* To make it the name or appellation of a person in this solitary instance has not only no analogy in the Bible, but is against the ordinary laws of language and the primary canon of exegesis. 2. The rendering, 'until Shiloh come,' not only introduces an unexpected new subject, but is against the context, inasmuch as the statement in verses 11 and 12 can only refer to Judah and not to the Messiah. This is admitted even by Bishop Patrick, who remarks, 'This verse (11) sets forth the great fertility of Judah's country;' and on verse 12, 'This verse sets forth the healthiness and vigor of the inhabitants of that fertile country.' To take the second clause of verse 10 as introducing a new subject, and to refer the verbs which immediately follow this new subject to the first subject, is to do that which will not be admitted in the interpretation of any other document. Bishop Wordsworth, who evidently felt this objection, consistently refers verses 11 and 12 also to the Messiah. Hence he explains the verses in question as follows: '*Binding his foal unto the vine,*' etc. 'Christ, who adopts this language, and compares his own union with the Church to that of a vine and its branches.' (John xv, 1–5.) '*He washed his garments,*' etc., that is, the garments and clothes of Christ, his royal and sacerdotal robes, (see Rev. i, 13), which he sprinkled with blood, being priest and sacrifice in one. '*His eyes shall be red with wine,*' etc. 'Christ's members, illuminated with spiritual light, shall sparkle with holy joy,' etc. This mode of interpretation requires no comment. 3. When the name Shiloh occurs as the accusative of place, the phrase is ויבא שילח '*and he came to Shiloh,*' (1 Sam. iv, 12,) exactly as in the passage before us. 4. The natural rendering, that is, 'The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . until he come to Shiloh,' refers to the primacy of Judah, and is in perfect harmony with the future history of the tribe. Judah was not only numerically the first, (Num. i and xxvi,) but was the leader of the tribes on their journeys, (Num. x, 14,) obtained his allotment of the conquered land be-

fore all the other tribes, (Josh. xv,) and never ceased to be the head of the tribes till they all came to Shiloh. (Josh. xviii, 1.) The tribe of Judah continued its primacy in the war with the Canaanites (Judg. i, 1, 2) and Benjamin, (Judg. xx, 18;) and when the people had to choose judges, this tribe was the first to open the line. (Judg. iii, 9.) 5. The Jewish interpretation of Shiloh by Messiah, which, as usual, is followed by the ancient versions and the Fathers, owes its origin to the exegetical canon called *Gimatria*, according to which every letter of a word is reduced to its numerical value, and the word is explained by another of the same quantity. Hence משיח *Messiah*, which is numerically 358, (ח 8+י 10+ש 300+מ 40=358,) is substituted for יבא שילה which is also numerically 358 (ה 5+ל 30+י 10+ש 300+א 1+ב 2+י 10=358.) These are the arguments, besides the two mentioned by the Bishop of Ely, against departing here from the usual meaning which Shiloh has every-where else. Whether these arguments are conclusive or not the intelligent student must decide; and we have therefore a right to insist that they should all have been enumerated, and not have been reduced to two, and these not the most cogent. Such omissions can only injure a good cause."—Pp. 80, 81.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1872. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Yule's Edition of Marco Polo. 2. Lace-making as a Fine Art. 3. Tyerman's Life of John Wesley. 4. Tylor on Primitive Culture. 5. Crowe and Cavalcaselle on the History of Painting. 6. Railway Organization in the late War. 7. Irish University Education. 8. Grant's Central Provinces of India. 9. Mr. Browning's Balaustion. 10. The Church, the Land, and the Liberals.

We have seen, if we rightly recollect, an announcement of the intended republication, by an American house, of the works on the early history of our race by Edward B. Tylor. They consist of several large volumes, displaying great research, and may produce no little impression upon the public mind. His leading principles may be thus stated:—

1. The fullest investigation of the lowest savage life clearly manifests a difference *in kind* between human and brute intelligence. The characteristic of the former is mechanical *stationariness*, the law of the latter is *progress*. Whatever may be the fact as to human genesis or the varieties of human species, human nature is one. 2. The scale of advance in progress

is so slow as to require a great antiquity of the human race. 3. In the department of spiritual progress, the origin and youth of what he calls "Animism," (spiritism, the doctrine of superhuman intelligences, as ghosts, gods, religions, etc.,) is regulated by historic laws, a certain sort of origin and certain series of advancement being discoverable. Thus a natural history of religions discloses itself, exhibiting, like all the other elements of man's nature, the traits of regular development.

The Edinburgh Reviewer, in the *Fourth Article*, coincides with Mr. Tylor in most of his views, but takes issue with his position that development in religion is proof of the untruth of religious belief.

The Reviewer, in refutation of Mr. Tylor's claim of the universality of the Stone Period of civilization, clearly shows the significant fact that the very locality which sacred history assigns as the area of the primitive birth of the human race shows no remains of the stone implements!

"On examining the evidence it turns out that this south-western area of the Asiatic continent is precisely the region where no distinct traces of the Stone Age have yet been discovered. Mr. Tylor gives no instance of the discovery of flint implements in any part of this wide region. No direct evidence, indeed, of the existence of a savage Stone Age there is adduced by him; and the only fragment of indirect evidence he offers is of a singulary far-fetched and irrelevant kind."—P. 50.

DEGENERATION OF RACES.—"Occasionally degeneration of race is a well-established fact within the historic period; and we may fairly conclude, therefore, that it must have occurred also in pre-historic times. The powerful arguments in Mr. Wallace's striking essay on 'The Limits of Natural Selection as applied to Man,' all tend to show that the lower savages are rather degenerate races than undeveloped types of mankind. As the evidence at present stands, all that can be said is, that the further back we go we do not necessarily get nearer to the typical or ideal savage—a being destitute of almost all distinctively human characteristics; and that in one vital particular at least, that of art, the earliest known race is far in advance of most savage tribes, if not of some cultured peoples. As we have already said, in reviewing the statements on this subject, 'There is no evidence that the man of those early days was

more nearly related to the animals than ourselves. If, as some naturalists have supposed, we are descended from the same ancestors as the higher apes, the transitional forms are not met with in the quaternary strata of Europe. They must be sought for in deposits elsewhere of far higher antiquity. There is not the slightest shred of proof, in either the cave or river deposits, in favor of such a view.' "—P. 57.

DEVELOPMENT OF "ANIMISM."—Mr. Tylor repudiates the one-sidedness of Max Müller in tracing all religious developments in etymologies. He says:

> "For myself, I am disposed to think (differing here in some measure from Prof. Max Müller's view of the subject) that the mythology of the lower races rests especially on a basis of real and sensible analogy, and that the great expansion of verbal metaphor into myth belongs to more advanced periods of civilization. In a word, I take material myth to be the primary, the verbal myth to be the secondary, formation. But whether this opinion be historically sound or not, the difference in nature between myth founded on fact and myth founded on word is sufficiently manifest. The want of reality in verbal metaphor cannot be effectually hidden by the utmost stretch of imagination.

"Further on," says the Reviewer, "in dealing at large with the myths derived from natural objects, Mr. Tylor condemns still more emphatically the extravagances of solar interpretation which the writings of the meteorological school illustrate.

> "No one-sided interpretation can be permitted to absorb into a single theory such endless many-sided correspondences as these. Rash inferences which on the strength of mere resemblance derive episodes of myth from episodes of nature must be regarded with utter mistrust; for the student who has no more stringent criterion than this for his myths of sun and sky and dawn will find them wherever it pleases him to seek them. It may be judged by simple trial what such a method may lead to; no legend, no allegory, no nursery rhyme, is safe from the hermeneutics of a thorough-going mythologic theorist."—P. 61.

In regard to Mr. Tylor's basing his belief of spiritual beings on his development theory, the Reviewer says: "Mr. Tylor's general argument on this head appears to be, that inasmuch as the belief in spiritual existences prevails universally among savages and barbarous tribes, such beings do not exist. This is no doubt a very summary turning of the tables on the old position, that the universal and irresistible character of this belief is, to some extent at least, an evidence of its objective validity. But, after all, there seems to be more reason in the old position than in the new. That a given belief, with regard to the existence of objects out of itself, should inevitably arise from the contact of the human mind with the material universe, would seem at first sight to afford at least a presumption of its more nearly related to the animals than ourselves. If, as some naturalists have supposed, we are descended from the same ancestors as the higher apes, the transitional forms are not met with in the quaternary strata of Europe. They must be sought for in deposits elsewhere of far higher antiquity. There is not the slightest shred of proof, in either the cave or river deposits, in favor of such a view."—P. 57.

DEVELOPMENT OF "ANIMISM."—Mr. Tylor repudiates the one-sidedness of Max Müller in tracing all religious developments to etymologies. He says:

> "For myself, I am disposed to think (differing here in some measure from Prof. Max Müller's view of the subject) that the mythology of the lower races rests especially on a basis of real and sensible analogy, and that the great expansion of verbal metaphor into myth belongs to more advanced periods of civilization. In a word, I take material myth to be the primary; the verbal myth to be the secondary, formation. But whether this opinion be historically sound or not, the difference in nature between myth founded on fact and myth founded on word is sufficiently manifest. The want of reality in verbal metaphor cannot be effectually hidden by the utmost stretch of imagination.

"Further on," says the Reviewer, "in dealing at large with the myths derived from natural objects, Mr. Tylor condemns still more emphatically the extravagances of solar interpretation which the writings of the meteorological school illustrate.

> "No one-sided interpretation can be permitted to absorb into a single theory such endless many-sided correspondences as these. Rash inferences which on the strength of mere resemblance derive episodes of myth from episodes of nature must be regarded with utter mistrust; for the student who has no more stringent criterion than this for his myths of sun and sky and dawn will find them wherever it pleases him to seek them. It may be judged by simple trial what such a method may lead to; no legend, no allegory, no nursery rhyme, is safe from the hermeneutics of a thorough-going mythologic theorist."—P. 81.

In regard to Mr. Tylor's basing his belief of spiritual beings on his development theory, the Reviewer says: "Mr. Tylor's general argument on this head appears to be, that inasmuch as the belief in spiritual existences prevails universally among savages and barbarous tribes, such beings do not exist. This is no doubt a very summary turning of the tables on the old position, that the universal and irresistible character of this belief is, to some extent at least, an evidence of its objective validity. But, after all, there seems to be more reason in the old position than in the new. That a given belief, with regard to the existence of objects out of itself, should inevitably arise from the contact of the human mind with the material universe, would seem at first sight to afford at least a presumption of its having some foundation in nature; and this presumption is certainly not rebutted by the fact that the belief is found in a crude or elementary shape even among the lower races. This is exactly what we should expect if the belief is a distinctive product of human reason or conscious intelligence working on the materials of experience. Mr. Tylor, in the first chapter of his work, attempts to meet the argument that the universality of a belief is a presumption in favor of its having some foundation in the nature of things, by saying that 'the cause why men do hold an opinion, or practice a custom, is by no means necessarily a reason why they ought to do so.' This is true enough, of course. But, on the other hand, the fact that a particular belief universally prevails is surely in itself no proof that it is a mere subjective delusion, and as such ought to be rejected. Mr. Tylor goes on to say, in obvious reference to the subsequent discussion as to the belief of spiritual beings:—

> "As it has more than once happened to myself to find my collections of traditions and beliefs thus made to prove their own objective truth, without proper examination of the grounds on which they were actually received, I take this occasion of remarking that the same line of argument will serve equally well to demonstrate, by the strong and wide consent of nations, that the earth is flat, and nightmare the visit of a demon.

"The only plausibility which this statement possesses as an argument lies in the illustrations, and they are altogether irrelevant. That such examples should be offered as parallel cases to the belief in the existence of spiritual beings, illustrates afresh the psychological confusion often found in Mr. Tylor's reasoning on philosophical questions. In this case, the confusion is that between a general law and the primitive or childish attempts at its application—between a rational principle and the crude, uncultured examples of its early working. Given the belief in the existence of spiritual powers as the universal characteristic of human reason, such a belief would be sure to manifest itself in grotesque and monstrous forms in the early operations of the savage mind. It would naturally result in the attribution of souls or spiritual life to stocks and stones, tools and weapons, as well as to more striking objects and forces in the material world. But these attributions, even when most extreme and absurd, do not discredit, much less disprove, the essential rationality and objective worth of the belief, any more than the attribution of particular effects to having some foundation in nature; and this presumption is certainly not rebutted by the fact that the belief is found in a crude or elementary shape even among the lower races. This is exactly what we should expect if the belief is a distinctive product of human reason or conscious intelligence working on the materials of experience. Mr. Tylor, in the first chapter of his work, attempts to meet the argument that the universality of a belief is a presumption in favor of its having some foundation in the nature of things, by saying that 'the cause why men do hold an opinion, or practice a custom, is by no means necessarily a reason why they ought to do so.' This is true enough, of course. But, on the other hand, the fact that a particular belief universally prevails is surely in itself no proof that it is a mere subjective delusion, and as such ought to be rejected. Mr. Tylor goes on to say, in obvious reference to the subsequent discussion as to the belief of spiritual beings—

"As it has more than once happened to myself to find [illegible] and beliefs that seem to prove their own negative truth, [illegible] of the grounds on which they were at first received, I take this occasion of remarking that the same line of argument will serve equally well to demonstrate, by the strong and wide consent of nations, that the earth is flat, and nightmare the visit of a demon."

"The only plausibility which this statement possesses as an argument lies in the illustrations, and they are altogether irrelevant. That such examples should be offered as parallel cases to the belief in the existence of spiritual beings, illustrates afresh the psychological confusion often found in Mr. Tylor's reasoning on philosophical questions. In this case, the confusion is that between a general law and the primitive or childish attempts at its application—between a rational principle and the crude, unenlightened examples of its early working. Given the belief in the existence of spiritual powers as the universal characteristic of human reason, such a belief would be sure to manifest itself in grotesque and monstrous forms in the early operations of the savage mind. It would naturally result in the attribution of souls or spiritual life to sticks and stones, tools and weapons, as well as to more striking objects and forces in the material world. But these attributions, even when most extreme and absurd, do not discredit, much less disprove, the essential rationality and objective worth of the belief, any more than the attribution of particular effects to absurd causes destroys the existence of causation in nature. The two cases are indeed strictly parallel; and Mr. Tylor's general argument, transferred to the region of science, would be, that because particular effects have been referred by the rude and ignorant to false and preposterous causes, therefore no such thing as real power or effective causation exists in nature. Both beliefs are, in fact, the natural reflex of the conscious intelligence which is the distinctive attribute of man."—Pp. 61, 62.

The *Third Article* speaks thus of English Wesleyanism: "We have spoken of Wesleyanism as a system essentially temporary. To this view of it probably many of its adherents would strongly demur; but even they can hardly deny that the range of its influence is necessarily a limited one. If not sectarian, it is at least undoubtedly sectional. Even in the land of its nativity it is incapable of covering more than a portion of the ground which the Church of Christ is designed to occupy. Unadapted by its founder to undertake the work of a Church, it can never, unless by ceasing to be Wesleyanism, meet the requirements of a whole Christian community. We forbear to dwell on its theological peculiarities, or to discuss its questionable doctrines of instantaneous conversion, plenary assurance, and attainable perfection. Enough to point out that the Wesleyan body is restricted, by its very constitution and by its legalized standing, to the arbitrary basis of its founder's special views—a disability not to be obviated by the tendency of its abler and more thoughtful members to drop or materially modify its most distinctive tenets. But, viewed as an ecclesiastical system only, it is obviously unequal to satisfy the spiritual wants of the Christianized body social, its rigid scheme of itinerancy forbidding the formation of an effective pastorate, and its obligatory rule of class-meetings being perilous to domestic union, and repulsive (to say the least) to minds of independence, cultivation, and delicacy. Its appropriate work, therefore, is evidently a partial one, supplementary to that of the Church catholic. For making onslaughts on the virtual heathenism of the masses, and for keeping alive the sacred fire in those classes of the community with whom religion is before all things a matter of feeling, it is an agency of singular efficacy and value; and in this respect there is still ample work absurd causes destroys the existence of causation in nature. The two cases are indeed strictly parallel; and Mr. Tylor's general argument, transferred to the region of science, would be, that because particular effects have been referred by the rude and ignorant to false and preposterous causes, therefore no such thing as real power or effective causation exists in nature. Both beliefs are, in fact, the natural reflex of the conscious intelligence which is the distinctive attribute of man."—Pp. 61, 62.

The *Third Article* speaks thus of English Wesleyanism: "We have spoken of Wesleyanism as a system essentially temporary. To this view of it probably many of its adherents would strongly demur; but even they can hardly deny that the range of its influence is necessarily a limited one. If not sectarian, it is at least undoubtedly sectional. Even in the land of its nativity it is incapable of covering more than a portion of the ground which the Church of Christ is designed to occupy. Unadapted by its founder to undertake the work of a Church, it can never, unless by ceasing to be Wesleyanism, meet the requirements of a whole Christian community. We forbear to dwell on its theological peculiarities, or to discuss its questionable doctrines of instantaneous conversion, plenary assurance, and attainable perfection. Enough to point out that the Wesleyan body is restricted, by its very constitution and by its legalized standing, to the arbitrary basis of its founder's special views—a disability not to be obviated by the tendency of its abler and more thoughtful members to drop or materially modify its most distinctive tenets. But, viewed as an ecclesiastical system only, it is obviously unequal to satisfy the spiritual wants of the Christianized body social, its rigid scheme of itinerancy forbidding the formation of an effective pastorate, and its obligatory rule of class-meetings being perilous to domestic union, and repulsive (to say the least) to minds of independence, cultivation, and delicacy. Its appropriate work, therefore, is evidently a partial one, supplementary to that of the Church catholic. For making onslaught on the virtual heathenism of the masses, and for keeping alive the sacred fire in those classes of the community with whom religion is before all things a matter of feeling, it is an agency of singular efficacy and value; and in this respect there is still ample work before it in England of the same nature as that which it has already accomplished. But the question remains, Must this be done in rivalry, and almost in antagonism, with other Christian bodies? or shall it be done in harmonious co-operation with them—above all, with its natural ally and acknowledged parent, the National Church? We cherish the hope that such an amalgamation with the Church may yet be found possible; and that amidst the grave and unknown changes impending over our ecclesiastical system, this desirable result may yet be realized. Room might assuredly be found within the Establishment, or in a privileged position at its side, for the exercise of that distinctive discipline of Wesleyanism which commends itself to many minds, and which has unquestionably been found peculiarly suitable to certain ranks of society.

"Our hopes of such a result are increased by what we see in the United States. There, where advantage was wisely taken of the political situation of the country after the War of Independence, the Methodist Episcopal Church became, to a great extent, the inheritor and representative of the old Church of England. This it still is, side by side with its Anglican sister; and, indeed, by the help of a wise modification of its original arrangements, approaches more nearly than any other religious body to the position of a National Establishment."—Pp. 44, 45.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1872. (London.)—1. The Works of George Berkeley. 2. Wesley's Character and Opinions in Earlier Life. 3. Balaustion's Adventure. 4. Pictures of the Past Year. 5. The Life of William Cunningham. 6. The Athanasian Creed. 7. Extempore Preaching.

It is a genuine disaster for Wesley and Wesleyanism that the mass of materials collected by the industrious zeal of Mr. Tyerman had not been placed in the hands of the graceful writer of the *second article* of this Quarterly. To a perfect command of elegant English he adds such a true sympathy, entering into the mind of his subject, and such a power of blending the crude facts into truthful and truthlike texture, as would have given us a genuine Wesley.

The main purpose of the article is to furnish us a true conception of Wesley until the time of his return from Georgia to London. Some new disclosures of the feminine side of Wesley's early history are given, serving to humanize the picture without degrading it. The defect of the article, so far as the clear de-before it in England of the same nature as that which it has already accomplished. For the question remains, Shall this be done in rivalry, and almost in antagonism, with other Christian bodies? or shall it be done in connection or co-operation with them—above all, with its natural ally and acknowledged parent, the National Church? We cherish the hope that such an amalgamation with the Church may yet be found possible; and that amidst the grave and unknown changes impending over our ecclesiastical system, this desirable result may yet be realized. Room might assuredly be found within the Establishment, or in a privileged position at its side, for the exercise of that distinctive discipline of Wesleyanism which commends itself to many minds, and which has unquestionably been found peculiarly suitable to certain ranks of society.

"Our hopes of such a result are increased by what we see in the United States. There, when advantage was wisely taken of the political situation of the country after the War of Independence, the Methodist Episcopal Church became, to a great extent, the inheritor and representative of the old Church of England. This it still is, side by side with its Anglican sister; and, indeed, by the help of a wise modification of its original arrangements, approaches more nearly than any other religious body to the position of a National Establishment."—Pp. 44, 45.

London Quarterly Review, January, 1871. (Wesleyan.)—1. The Works of George Berkeley. 2. Wesley's Character and Opinions in Early Life. 3. Missionary Adventure. 4. Reforms of the Past Year. 5. The Life of William Cunningham. 6. The Athanasian Creed. 7. Extempore Preaching.

It is a genuine disaster for Wesley and Wesleyanism, that the mass of materials collected by the industrious zeal of Mr. Tyerman had not been placed in the hands of the graceful writer of the second article of this Quarterly. To a perfect command of elegant English he adds such a true sympathy, entering into the mind of his subject, and such a power of blending the crude facts into truthful and truthlike texture, as would have given us a genuine Wesley.

The main purpose of the article is to furnish us a true conception of Wesley until the time of his return from Georgia to London. Some new disclosures of the feminine side of Wesley's early history are given, serving to humanize the picture without degrading it. The defect of the article, so far as the clear delineation of Wesley's religious character is concerned, is the omission of a decisive discussion of the actual justification of a man in Wesley's state of soul. Are we to suppose that he was truly no child of God until his strange warming of the heart in reading Luther on Galatians? We believe, in the negative, that this blessed heart-warming was the inflow of the Spirit of Assurance, translating him from a sense of servitude to the rich consciousness of his sonship. That rich consciousness was as new wine to the giant, rendering him mighty for his mighty work. It opened at once to him the sublime "secret of the Lord," and gave him a divine wisdom in bringing thousands, and ultimate millions, by a brief, straight route to that same rich result.

The following passages, all of which we heartily indorse, show how the best mind of English Methodism estimates Mr. Tyerman's Wesley:

"We are bound to say that Mr. Tyerman has overdone his fidelity. He seems to us to have acted the part, almost wherever possible, of *advocatus diaboli*—to have set himself to make the worst which, with any fair probability, could be made of Wesley's life and character. He never gives the benefit of the doubt, as it seems to us, to the accused, but always to the accuser. Considering who and what Wesley was, and what his antecedents and independent character must be admitted to have been, this appears to us not to be judicially fair. Besides this, there is a tone in his dealing with Wesley which fairly astonishes us at times. Mr. Tyerman does not merely sum up in phrase of precise accuracy just what happened, and leave his readers to draw their conclusions: he censures, he pronounces, he condemns; and this, too, in a tone of harshness, in some instances, and of lofty decision, as if he were Wesley's superior and judge. We believe that Macaulay—it is perfectly certain that Southey—would never have ventured, in so absolute, unceremonious, dictatorial a style, to pronounce censure on John Wesley. They would have felt their own inferiority to him—that, if he sometimes erred, he was at least a good and great man, a venerable saint, as to whom they could not venture to pronounce an unfavorable judgment even in individual acts of his life, without modesty and self-restraint, without what the Romans would have called *verecundia*. Mr. Tyerman has not been restrained by any such feelings. At times his mere *ipse* fication of Wesley's religious character is concerned, is the omission of a decisive discussion of the actual justification of a man in Wesley's state of soul. Are we to suppose that he was truly no child of God until his strange warming of the heart in reading Luther on Galatians? We believe, in the negative, that this blessed heart-warming was the inflow of the Spirit of Assurance, translating him from a sense of servitude to the rich consciousness of his sonship. That rich consciousness was as new wine to the giant, rendering him mighty for his mighty work. It opened at once to him the sublime "secret of the Lord," and gave him a divine wisdom in bringing thousands, and ultimate millions, by a brief, straight route to that same rich result.

The following passages, all of which we heartily indorse, show how the best mind of English Methodism estimates Mr. Tyerman's Wesley:

"We are bound to say that Mr. Tyerman has overdone his fidelity. He seems to us to have acted the part, almost wherever possible, of *advocatus diaboli*—to have set himself to make the worst which, with any fair probability, could be made of Wesley's life and character. He never gives the benefit of the doubt, as it seems to us, to the accused, but always to the accuser. Considering who and what Wesley was, and what his antecedents and independent character must be admitted to have been, this appears to us not to be judicially fair. Besides this, there is a tone in his dealing with Wesley which fairly astonishes us at times. Mr. Tyerman does not merely sum up in phrase of precise accuracy just what happened, and leave his readers to draw their conclusions: he censures, he pronounces, he condemns; and this, too, in a tone of harshness, in some instances, and of lofty decision, as if he were Wesley's superior and judge. We believe that Macaulay—it is perfectly certain that Southey—would never have ventured, in so absolute, unconscious, dictatorial a style, to pronounce censure on John Wesley. They would have felt their own inferiority to him—that, if he sometimes erred, he was at least a good and great man, a venerable saint, as to whom they could not venture to pronounce an unfavorable judgment even in individual acts of his life, without modesty and self-restraint, without what the Romans would have called *verecundia*. Mr. Tyerman has not been restrained by any such feelings. At times his mere *dixit*, without even the formality of any attempt to weigh evidence or investigate the matter, pronounces sharp and short at once the folly or the wrong-doing of Wesley. Surely men should be as tender in their style of handling the character of departed saints and heroes as of living men. But if his brethren were to pronounce judgment on Mr. Tyerman's sayings and doings with decision as abrupt and unsparing as he uses in dealing with the father and founder of Methodism, we imagine he would have a very good ground of brotherly complaint against them. . . . Nothing is more remarkable, however, than that Mr. Tyerman appears to make no effort to enter fully and lovingly into the mind and idiosyncrasy of Wesley. He is not in sympathy with him, and yet does not appear to feel that this is the case, or even that such sympathy is necessary in order to enable him to write the life of Wesley. He judges merely and unhesitatingly by his own lights and his own instincts. Those instincts, at least in some cases, we regard as mere conventional prejudices, and are prepared to vindicate Wesley just where and wherefore his biographer condemns him. But, indeed, nothing is more evident than that Mr. Tyerman is deficient in that faculty of dramatic sympathy and insight without which it is impossible for any man to understand, much less to write, the life of another man, especially of a unique and wonderful man. . . . Such was the unprosperous issue of Wesley's third love affair. He was not, it must be confessed, fortunate in these affairs; but they illustrate very strongly the real nature of the man, equally on his weak and on his fine human side. On the whole, we cannot but love our Wesley the better for these revelations. At the same time, it is a matter of regret that Mr. Tyerman has so inadequately rendered them; as he has, in our judgment, inadequately, inapprehensively, and therefore with entire (though altogether unconscious) unfairness, represented throughout his volumes Wesley's relations of affection and confidence with women."—Pp. 309, 310, 343.

The *Athanasian Creed*, the subject of the *sixth article*, though in the Ninth Century accepted as a "Standard of Faith," has been generally rejected in America—first by the Protestant Episcopal Church, by Methodism in accordance with Wesley's omission, and by our evangelical Churches generally. We do not regret that it stands not among our own standards,

believing that the Apostles' Creed, our Articles of Faith, and Mr. Wesley's Sermon on the Trinity, contain all that upon so mysterious yet fundamental a dogma should be prescribed as representative.

The Review says: "Like every other ancient and reverend document, the Athanasian Creed is undergoing its ordeal, a stern and unrelenting ordeal, at which the friends and the enemies of the Christian faith alike assist. . . . There may be said to be four classes of its Christian critics; to three of these Mr. Brewer does ample justice. . . . First, there are those who reject the Creed altogether, as being a human intrusion into 'things not seen,' and no better than a desperate effort of dogmatic theology to formulate in words what neither reason nor revelation brings within the range of finite conception. To this class belong great numbers of theologians, preachers, and private Christians, who own no theology but the 'Biblical;' and their ranks are reinforced by many who believe what the Creed says, but recoil from its statement in words. The second class is composed of those who accept it in its integrity, as a sacred deposit or tradition from antiquity, containing the final expression of a doctrine developed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and reduced to a formula which, composed by some individual, was received and ratified by the universal Church. They regard it as the last word, whether positive or negative, on the most sublime of all mysteries and the most fundamental of all verities; and, so regarding it, the stately sentences come to have a fascination that no other uninspired language possesses, and an authority closely bordering on, if it does not coincide with, that of inspiration. This being the case, it is not to be wondered at that they feel no misgiving about the 'excluding clauses,' for Scripture throws around its own teachings precisely the same sanction. A third class is composed of those who reverence the Creed, and find no fault in it save as concerning the damnatory sentences, and the touch of heresy that its language has derived from the exigencies of translation into modern forms of speech, which cannot adapt themselves to the requirements of the subject. They would retain the formula in the services of the Church after some revision—the more thorough the better; and if the severe introductory clauses are retained, they would append a very clear and uncompromising believing that the Apostles' Creed, nor Articles of Faith, and Mr. Wesley's Sermon on the Trinity, contain all that upon so mysterious yet fundamental a dogma should be prescribed as representative.

The Review says: "Like every other ancient and venerable document, the Athanasian Creed is undergoing its ordeal, a stern and unrelenting ordeal, at which the friends and the enemies of the Christian faith alike assist. . . . There may be said to be four classes of its Christian critics; to three of these Mr. Stevens does ample justice. . . . First, there are those who reject the Creed altogether, as being a human intrusion into 'things not seen,' and no better than a desperate effort of dogmatic theology to formulate in words what neither reason nor revelation brings within the range of finite conceptions. To this class belong great numbers of theologians, preachers, and private Christians, who own no theology but the 'Biblical;' and their ranks are reinforced by many who believe what the Creed says, but recoil from its statement in words. The second class is composed of those who accept it in its integrity, as a sacred deposit or tradition from antiquity, containing the final expression of a doctrine developed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and reduced to a formula which, composed by some individual, was received and ratified by the universal Church. They regard it as the last word, whether positive or negative, on the most sublime of all mysteries and the most fundamental of all verities; and, so regarding it, the stately sentences seem to have a fascination that no other uninspired language possesses, and an authority closely bordering on, if it does not coincide with, that of inspiration. This being the case, it is not to be wondered at that they feel no misgiving about the 'excluding clauses,' for Scripture throws around its own teachings precisely the same sanction. A third class is composed of those who reverence the Creed, and find no fault in it save as concerning the damnatory sentences, and the touch of heresy that its language has derived from the exigencies of translation into modern forms of speech, which cannot adapt themselves to the requirements of the subject. They would retain the formula in the services of the Church after some revision—the more thorough the better; and if the severe introductory clauses are retained, they would append a very plain and uncompromising disavowal of any such meaning in them as now seems to offend against Christian charity."—Pp. 426, 427.

It is known to our readers that great objections are made to the word *person* to express the "somewhat" peculiar to each of the divine Three; derived from the fact that to popular apprehension the word expresses a complete individual man. To this the Review replies: "The word person is the simplest and the least easily misunderstood by the terms which are used to express the everlasting fact which the Creed proclaims, that in the mystery of the Holy Trinity there are three individual intelligent agents who can use the term *I*, and yet, in a sense transcending human thought, are in the essence of divinity, *one*." "The term person, when combined with the two other terms now commonly used in English theology, keeps just enough of its original meaning to enrich and complete our notions. Every one of the Sacred Three is a subsistence in the common Divine Being, or Essence, or Substance. Each is an hypostasis, having his own individuality, and to be honored by Himself; but each also is a Person on whom the eye of faith—there is no other eye in this region—beholds a manifestation of the Eternal God. And happy are we in our theology that each of these terms has become so familiar; and that all are combined in their several proprieties in 'even our common diction.' This can scarcely be said of any other language with the same confidence.

"The word person has another remarkable prerogative in theology, as represented by the Athanasian Creed. It mediates, better than any other term could, between substance and attributes. The person in the Trinity is not identical with the essence or substance; for there are not three independent substances. Yet it is not to be regarded as synonymous with attributes, for the three Persons are 'each by Himself' possessed of all that is called God. Each Person is a subsistence sustaining all the perfections of the Godhead; while each is but the same God in an unbroken unity. Now this is a region in which all analogy fails. We are shut up to the use of such terms as shall avoid two opposite extremes, neither of which is consistent with the plain word of God. The Deity is one; the distinction is therefore not that of substances but of persons. The Father and the Son and the Spirit mutually bless and act disavowal of any such meaning in them as now seems to offend against Christian charity."—pp. 426, 427.

It is known to our readers that great objections are made to the word *person* to express the "somewhat" peculiar to each of the divine Three; derived from the fact that to popular apprehension the word expresses a complete individual man. To this the Review replies: "The word *person* is the simplest and the least easily misunderstood by the terms which are used to express the everlasting fact which the Creed proclaims, that in the mystery of the Holy Trinity there are three individual intelligent agents who can use the term *I*, and yet, in a sense transcending human thought, are in the essence of divinity, one." "The term person, when combined with the two other terms now commonly used in English theology, keeps just enough of its original meaning to enrich and complete our notions. Every one of the Sacred Three is a subsistence in the common Divine Being, or Essence, or Substance. Each is an hypostasis, having his own individuality, and to be known by Himself; but each also is a Person on whom the eye of faith—there is no other eye in this region—beholds a manifestation of the Eternal God. And happy are we in our theology that each of these terms has become so familiar; and that all are combined in their several proprieties to 'evoke our common diction.' This can scarcely be said of any other language with the same confidence.

"The word person has another remarkable prerogative in theology, as represented by the Athanasian Creed. It mediates, better than any other term could, between substance and attributes. The person in the Trinity is not identical with the essence or substance; for there are not three independent substances. Yet it is not to be regarded as synonymous with attributes, for the three Persons are 'each by Himself' possessed of all that is called God. Each Person is a subsistence sustaining all the perfections of the Godhead; while each is but the same God in an unbroken unity. Now this is a region in which all analogy fails. We are shut up to the use of such terms as shall avoid two opposite extremes, neither of which is consistent with the plain word of God. The Deity is one; the distinction is therefore not that of substance but of persons. The Father and the Son and the Spirit mutually bless and act and speak in man's salvation; the distinction must therefore be one of personal intelligences. The mystery is unfathomable. No definition can explain it."—Pp. 439, 441, 442.

No one analogy can, indeed, explain the essential mysteries of the Divine Nature. Yet there are surprising facts in human nature that may serve to check the contemptuous dogma of Anti-trinitarianism. The following lines, valueless for any other purpose, may be available for this:

As *I* walked by myself,
I talked to *myself*,
And myself *it* (or *he?*) said unto me,
Beware for *thyself*,
Take care for *thyself*,
For nobody careth for *thee*.

So far as the application of personal pronouns goes, here are at least three persons in one. First the initial *I*, second the reciprocal *myself*, and third the integer *thee*. Each term represents at once a particular constituent of the whole; yet each constituent takes in the whole. The action of each is distinct from the action of the other, and yet the spiritual substance of the three is one.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historical Theology.) Edited by Dr. Kahnis. 1872. Second Number.—1. RÖNSCH, The Carmen Apologeticum of Commodian. Revised Text with a Commentary. 2. VOLZ, Contributions to the History of Pietism.

We already have referred in a former number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" to a German pamphlet, published in 1871, by Leimbach, on the "Carmen Apologeticum" of Bishop Commodian. As Bishop Commodian, who lived in the middle of the third century, was, so far as we know, the first Christian poet of the Latin literature, we might have expected that the discovery of a new work by him, about twenty years ago, would not have failed to interest all students of the early literature of the Christian Church. It was therefore to be wondered at that, with the exception of an essay by Dr. Jacobi, (in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben*, 1853,) nothing at all was published on

the subject in Germany until, in 1868, Dr. Ebert, of Leipzic, published another valuable treatise on the poem, (Tertullian's *Verhältniss zu Minucius Felix, nebst einem Anhang über Commodian's Carmen Apologeticum*, Leipzic, 1868.) Though the name of Commodian was not mentioned in the manuscript of the poem, all the writers thus far quoted were fully agreed in regarding Bishop Commodian as its author. Dr. Ebert was, however, of opinion that Commodian was not an African bishop, but from Gaza in Syria. The pamphlet by Leimbach, above referred to, is not only in itself a new contribution of considerable value to the literature on Commodian and his newly discovered poem, but it has also succeeded in enlisting the special interest of the German theological periodicals in the subject, and in calling from them a number of valuable articles. The article in this number of the Journal for Historical Theology by Dr. Rönsch, who is favorably known in the theological world by a number of able essays on the literature of the early Christian Church, is, so far as we know, the fullest and completest work on Commodian's "Carmen Apologeticum." It fills one hundred and forty pages of this number of the Journal, and, after a learned introduction, giving the history of the discovery of the book and a review of the entire literature relating to it, it publishes the text, carefully revised, supplied with critical notes, and followed by an exhaustive commentary.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) 1872. Second Number.—1. PFLEIDERER, The Pauline Doctrine of Justification. 2. HILGENFELD, The Christ-party in Corinth, and the Nicolaites in Asia. 3. HITZIG, Whether Belthis and Osiris are mentioned in the Old Testament. 4. PRÆTORIUS, The Apocryphal Book of Baruch, translated from the Ethiopian. 5. HILGENFELD, Review of the new volume of Keim's Life of Jesus. 6. COENEN, On the Author and the Address of the Second and Third Epistles of John.

The apocryphal Apocalypse of Baruch has long been lost, with the exception of the conclusion. In 1866 Ceriani for the first time published the whole book in a Latin translation from a Syriac manuscript, (in the *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, vol. i, Milan, 1866,) and in 1871 O. F. Fritzsche received it into his excellent collection of the *Libri Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphi Selecti*, Leipsic, 1871. In the preface to the latter work Fritzsche mentions the kindred book of Baruch contained in Dillmann's *Chrestomathia Æthiopica*, Leips., 1866.

the subject in Germany until in 1868, Dr. Ebert, of Leipzig, published another valuable treatise on the poem (*Tertullian's Verhältniss zu Minucius Felix, nebst einem Anhang über Commodian's Carmen Apologeticum.* Leipzig, 1868). Though the name of Commodian was not mentioned in the manuscript of the poem, all the writers thus far quoted were fully agreed in regarding Bishop Commodian as its author. Dr. Ebert was, however, of opinion that Commodian was not an African bishop, but from Gaza in Syria. The pamphlet by Leimbach, above referred to, is not only in itself a new contribution of considerable value to the literature on Commodian and his newly discovered poem, but it has also succeeded in enlisting the special interest of the German theological periodicals in the subject, and in calling from them a number of valuable articles. The article in this number of the *Journal for Historical Theology* by Dr. Rönsch, who is favorably known to the theological world by a number of able essays on the literature of the early Christian Church, is, so far as we know, the fullest and completest work on Commodian's "Carmen Apologeticum." It fills one hundred and forty pages of this number of the Journal, and, after a learned introduction, giving the history of the discovery of the book and a review of the entire literature relating to it, it publishes the text, carefully revised, supplied with critical notes, and followed by an exhaustive commentary.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Edited by Hilgenfeld.) 1879. Second Number.—1. Hilgenfeld, The Pauline Epistles to the Thessalonians. 2. Hilgenfeld, The Christ-party in Corinth, and the Nicolaitans in Asia. 3. Bruun, Whether Stoicism and Cynicism are mentioned in the Old Testament. 4. Praetorius, The Apocryphal Book of Baruch, translated from the Ethiopic. 5. Hilgenfeld, Review of the new edition of Renan's Life of Jesus. 6. Görres, On the Author and the Address of the Second and Third Epistles of John.

The apocryphal Apocalypse of Baruch has long been lost, with the exception of the conclusion. In 1866 Ceriani for the first time published the whole book in a Latin translation from a Syriac manuscript, (in the *Monumenta Sacra et Profana,* vol. i, Milan, 1866,) and in 1871 O. F. Fritzsche received it into his excellent collection of the *Libri Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphi Selecti,* Leipzig, 1871. In the preface to the latter work Fritzsche mentions the kindred book of Baruch published in Dillmann's *Chrestomathia Æthiopica,* Leipzig, 1866.

Of this Ethiopian book of Baruch a German translation is given in the above number of the "Journal for Scientific Theology" by Dr. Prætorius, and it can now be compared with the Syriac book, and the kindred work, entitled *Τὰ Παραλει Πόμενα 'Ιερεμίου τοῦ Προφήτου*, which was printed as early as 1609 in the Greek *Menæum Venet.*, and which has been edited anew by Ceriani in the fifth volume of his *Monumenta.* Milan, 1868.

The Christ-party, which is mentioned in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (i, 12) as having caused disturbances in the Christian congregation at Corinth, continues even now, after eighteen hundred years, to produce considerable trouble among the exegetical writers. The founder of the rationalistic Tübingen school, Dr. Baur, has in particular discoursed on the subject at great length. His opinion, that this party professed an anti Pauline Judaism, has been approved even by orthodox writers like Dr. Beyschlag, (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1865,) who, however, repels the further opinion of Baur, which identifies this anti-Pauline Christ-party with the adherents of Peter and others of the twelve apostles, as utterly groundless. According to Beyschlag, it was only the Cephas party which represented at Corinth a Judaizing Christianity, in accordance with the views of the twelve apostles; while, on the other hand, the Christ-party consisted of Judaizing Christians, who were in direct opposition to all the apostles. Hilgenfeld, the editor of the "Journal for Scientific Theology," went even further than Dr. Baur, by assuming that the Christ-party not only professed a truly apostolical Judaism, but that it consisted of immediate disciples of Christ. (*Zeitschrift für wiss. Th.*, 1865.) His views are sustained by Holston, (*Zum Evangelium des Petrus und Paulus*, 1868,) while Klöpper (*Untersuchungen über den Zweiten Brief des Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Korinth*, 1869,) declares in favor of Beyschlag. The latter has recently once more reviewed the entire recent literature from his point of view, (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1871;) while in the above article of the Journal Hilgenfeld explains again his own theory. In the second part of his article, Hilgenfeld undertakes to prove that the heretics censured in the Apocalypse were the friends and adherents of the apostle Paul.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN 1871.—The Church of Ireland has now passed through the first year of its history as a disestablished Church. The law severing its connection with the State, and its former position as the privileged Church of Ireland, took effect on January 1, 1871, when all Church property became vested in commissioners, all ecclesiastical law was abolished, and the right of the bishops to sit in the House of Lords ceased. The first meeting of the Synod of the Irish Church was held on the 13th of April. A committee, at the head of which was William Brooke, Q. C., Master in Chancery, had been appointed in 1870 "to consider whether, without making any such alterations in the Liturgy or Formularies of our Church as would involve or imply a change in her doctrines, any measures can be suggested calculated to check the introduction and spread of novel doctrines and practices opposed to the principles of our Reformed Church," and it now brought in a report in which were suggested changes going to the root of sacerdotalism. It recommended that a new question and answer be added to the Catechism, declaring that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ are taken and received only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; that a declaration be added to the communion service, that no "adoration whatever is to be done to any presence of Christ or of Christ's flesh and blood supposed to be in the elements after or by the virtue of their consecration;" that the form of absolution be omitted in the visitation of the sick; that the words in the ordination service, "whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted," etc., be struck out; that the form "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc., be changed to a prayer; and that the word "priests," wherever it occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, be defined as equivalent to "presbyter." A set of canons was also submitted by the committee condemning and prohibiting in detail each and all of the symbolic practices which the Ritualists are seeking to incorporate in the services of the Church. The votes taken on the above and similar resolutions indicated that the Ritualists constitute a decided minority of the Synod. A motion brought in by one of their members, and declaring that no revision of the prayer book was desirable, except so far as the Disestablishment Act and the new situation of the Church had made necessary, was defeated by a vote (380 to 139) which showed a large majority of the Synod in favor of the revision. A similar result appeared when the vote was taken on the first proposition of the report of Master Brooke's committee—that declaring the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharistic elements to be "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." It was as follows: yeas, clergy, 117; laity, 271—total. 389; nays, clergy, 77; laity, 35—total, 114. The proposition, it is true,

Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

The Anglican Church in 1871.—The Church of Ireland has now passed through the first year of its history as a disestablished Church. The law severing its connection with the State, and its former position as the privileged Church of Ireland, took effect on January 1, 1871, when all Church property became vested in commissioners, all ecclesiastical law was abolished, and the right of the bishops to sit in the House of Lords ceased. The first meeting of the Synod of the Irish Church was held on the 18th of April. A committee, at the head of which was William Brooke, Q. C., Master in Chancery, had been appointed in 1870 "to consider whether, without making any such alterations in the Liturgy or Formularies of our Church as would involve or imply a change in her doctrines, any measures can be suggested calculated to check the introduction and spread of novel doctrines and practices opposed to the principles of our Reformed Church," and it now brought in a report in which were suggested changes going to the root of sacerdotalism. It recommended that a new question and answer be added to the Catechism, declaring that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ are taken and received only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; that a declaration be added to the communion service, that no "adoration whatever is to be done to any presence of Christ, or of Christ's flesh and blood supposed to be in the elements after or by the virtue of their consecration;" that the form of absolution be omitted in the visitation of the sick; that the words in the ordination service, "whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted," etc., be struck out; that the form "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc., be changed to a prayer; and that the word "priests," wherever it occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, be defined as equivalent to "presbyter." A set of canons was also submitted by the committee condemning and prohibiting in detail each and all of the symbolic practices which the Ritualists are seeking to incorporate in the services of the Church. The votes taken on the above and also on resolutions indicated that the Ritualists constitute a decided minority of the Synod. A motion brought in by one of their members, and declaring that no revision of the prayer book was desirable, except so far as the Disestablishment Act and the new situation of the Church had made necessary, was defeated by a vote of [illegible] to [illegible] which showed a large majority of the Synod in favor of the revision. A similar result appeared when the vote was taken on the first proposition of the Report of Master Brooke's committee—that declaring the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharistic elements to be "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." It was as follows: yeas, clergy, 117; laity, 772—total, 889; nays, clergy, 77; laity, 69—total, 146. The proposition, [illegible] was not carried, for it failed to receive the concurrence of two thirds of each order, voting by orders, as required by the Constitution, but it clearly indicates the influences which at present prevail in the Synod and in the Church. A canon was also adopted to the effect that no minister or other person, during the time of divine service should make the sign of the cross save when prescribed in the rubric; nor should he bow to, or do any other act of obeisance to, the Lord's table; nor should any bell be rung during divine service. A rubric was passed prescribing the ornaments that might be worn by the minister. The subject of revision was finally postponed, and referred to the bishops and a committee of twenty-two clergymen and eighteen laymen, representative members of the Synod, who are expected to report in 1872. The movement for the disestablishment of the Church of England, which has seemed to gather force among a large portion of the population of England, has led to the organization of a "Church Defense Institution." The Archbishop of Canterbury is president, and several of the Bishops are among the vice-presidents. It will direct movements to influence public opinion in favor of the continuance of the Establishment.

The Church of England has not yet introduced, like the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, the institution of annual conventions or annual councils, in which the clergy and laity of a diocese meet for deliberating on the affairs of the diocese and taking part in its administration. Efforts are, however, increasing to bring the clergy and laity of the respective dioceses into closer relations with each other. The Bishop of Ely is one of the most active promoters of these movements. In an address made to the diocesan conference of Ely in October, he remarked that he had now worked during eight years for the association of the two orders, under the feeling that the isolation of the clergy from the laity was one of the greatest practical evils in the system of the English Church. He began by inviting the rural deans to call together the chapters of the deaneries once a year for intercourse and consultation; he then invited the archdeacons and rural deans to meet with him at the cathedral; he then proposed that lay representatives should meet with them, forming a clerical and lay conference. Diocesan conferences were also held in 1871 at Chester and in several other dioceses. A diocesan "synod" met at Salisbury on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of November, and effected a permanent organization, adopting a set of standing orders, or constitution. All these bodies are, of course, purely voluntary, and are not capable of binding action. The annual Church Congress, which is not a body consisting of chosen representatives, but open to all who desire to join in discussions of important Church questions, appears to awaken in the Church an increasing interest. The Congress of 1871 was held at Nottingham, and attended by more than two thousand persons. It was presided over by the Bishop of Lincoln, and every variety of opinion prevailing in the Church was represented.

The Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, at its meeting in June, 1871, adopted the following declaration on the Vatican Council,

and directed it to be sent to all bishops in communion with the Church of England:

> That the Vatican Council has no just right to be termed an Œcumenical or General Council, and that none of its decrees have any claim for acceptance as canons of a General Council.
>
> That the dogma of Papal Infallibility now set forth by the Vatican Council is contrary to Holy Scripture, and to the judgment of the ancient Church universal.
>
> That there is one true Catholic and Apostolic Church, founded by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; that of this true Catholic and Apostolic Church the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her are living members; and that the Church of England earnestly desires to maintain firmly the catholic faith as set forth by the Œcumenical Council of the universal Church, and to be united upon those principles of doctrine and discipline, in the bonds of brotherly love, with all Churches in Christendom.
>
> That the assumption of supremacy by the Bishop of Rome in convening the late Vatican Council contravenes canons of the universal Church.

The Old Catholic opposition to the Vatican Council and the doctrine of Papal Infallibility awakened great hopes in the Church of England, and in particular in the High Church party, for a closer intercommunion between the Old Catholics on the one hand, and the Anglican Church and its branches on the other.

The official census taken in Great Britain and Ireland included, as in 1861, the religious profession of the inhabitants only for Ireland. The ecclesiastical statistics of that country were ascertained to be as follows:

Provinces.	Catholics.	Per Cent.	Anglican.	Prot. Dissenters.	Other Ch'ns.	Jews.
Connaught	803.532	96·2	36,345	5,551	565	..
Munster	1,302,475	93·7	77,366	9,622	929	10
Leinster	1,141,401	85·4	170,879	20,291	3,210	185
Ulster	894,525	48·9	398,705	522,774	14,331	63
Ireland, 1871	4,141,933	76·7	683,295	558,238	19,035	258
" 1861	4,505,265	77·7	693,357	581,154	18,798	393

Among the Protestant Dissenters there were, in 1871, 503,461 Presbyterians, 41,815 Methodists, 4,485 Independents, 4,643 Baptists, and 3,834 members of the Society of Friends.

The ecclesiastical statistics of England and Scotland can only be estimated. If the carefully-made calculations of the work, "Denominational Statistics of England and Wales," by E. G. Ravenstein, (London, 1870.) are taken as a basis, the following figures would be obtained:

	England.		Scotland.		G. Brit. & Ireland.	
	Population.	Per Cent.	Population.	Per Cent.	Population.	Per Cent.
Anglican Church	17,781,000	77·82	73,000	2·18	18,537,000	58·64
Church of Scotl'd.	....	....	1,473,000	43·87	1,473,000	4·66
Prot. Dissenters	3,971,000	17·38	1,486,000	44·24	6,034,000	19·09
Roman Catholics	1,058,000	4·63	320,000	9·54	5,520,000	17·46
Jews	39,000	0·17	6,000	0·17	46,000	0·15
Total	22,849,000	...	3,358,000	...	31,610,000	...

THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

The movement for establishing a closer inter-communion with those other branches of the Christian Church administered, like the Greek, by

bishops of apostolical succession, which has had for some time many influential friends in all the Eastern countries, received in 1871 a powerful impulse, and gathered new strength by the Old Catholic movement in Germany and other countries. A learned theologian of the Russian Church spent several months in consultation with Dr. Döllinger, and the Old Catholic Congress held in September at Munich was attended by several Russian clergymen. Among them were Dr. Overbeck, who was originally a Roman Catholic priest in Germany, and after joining the Orthodox Greek Church went to England, where he established the "Orthodox Review," a periodical devoted to the interests of the Greek Church, and Professor Ossunin, who was specially deputed to the Congress as the representative of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg. Dr. Overbeck afterward declared in the "Goloss" of St. Petersburg, that he had come to the conclusion that the best settlement the Old Catholics could make of the question of their Church organization would be to join the Church of Russia; but he acknowledged that Dr. Döllinger had received his proposition, when it was made to him, very unfavorably. Professor Ossunin, after his return to St. Petersburg from the Old Catholic Congress, in whose proceedings he had taken an active part, lectured on the Old Catholic Congress and the inter-communion question to large audiences, and, later in the year, invited two leaders of the Old Catholic movement—Professor Friedrich of Munich and Professor Michelis of Braunsberg—to come to St. Petersburg, and there make themselves fully familiar with the organization and the doctrines of the Eastern Churches, in order to facilitate the negotiations for a closer union.

The intercourse between the Eastern and the Anglican Churches is from year to year becoming more friendly. The important step taken by the late Patriarch Gregory, of Constantinople, in 1870, in this direction, when he sanctioned the burial of the English dead in the consecrated cemeteries of the Greek Church with the customary rites of this Church, was followed by several others in 1871. The Greek Archbishop of Syros, returning from a visit to England, addressed to the Greek Synod a flattering account of the reception he met and the honors he received from the bishops and the clergy of the Anglican Church, but concluded by expressing his belief that "the union of the two Churches [the English and the Greek] cannot be the work of the present day." The English Bishop Harris, of Gibraltar, visiting Athens, accepted an invitation of the Archbishop, who is the Primate of Greece, to assist in full canonical robes at one of the national religious festivals in the cathedral church. More recently Bishop Harris has received similar episcopal recognition from the Bishop of Varna in Bulgaria. The "Orthodox Review" hopes for a continued advance in friendship, but cautions the members of both Churches against supposing that any union yet exists, and calls attention to many points in the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church which are at variance with the fundamental doctrines of the Greek Church.

Early in 1871 the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States received from the first presiding member of the governing

Synod of all Russia, Metropolitan Isidore, of Novgorod and St. Petersburg, a reply to a letter addressed by the American Bishops in 1869 to the governing Synod of the Russian Church, in order to express a desire for a closer inter-communion, and in particular for a reciprocal participation in the solemn performance of the sacrament. While expressing the utmost gladness at the new proof of respect shown by the representatives of the Episcopal Church, and at their "estimable purpose concerning the union of the Churches," the Russian Metropolitan yet declares that the Eastern Church firmly adheres to the principles and convictions so clearly stated in the messages sent in 1723 by the orthodox Patriarchs of the East in reply to the Anglican Bishops, and that she considers a previous agreement in faith as peremptorily indispensable before the practical mutual participation in the sacraments, inasmuch as the first is the only possible groundwork or basis for the last.

The Bulgarian Church question continued to agitate the Greek Church of Turkey throughout the year 1871. The committee of six Bulgarian bishops, which, in accordance with the firman of February 26, 1870, met in Constantinople, in union with prominent Bulgarian notables of the Turkish Senate, in order to prepare a draft for the organization of an autonomous Bulgarian exarchate, (the main points of this draft were given in the Methodist Quarterly Review, 1871, p. 319,) drew up at the same time an act for the election, by the communities of clerical and lay deputies of a national assembly, to meet in Constantinople in April, 1871, for the rectification of the Church statutes. An active discussion took place in this assembly between those who advocated the application of the regulations of the old Greek Church to the new exarchate, and a progressive party which favored the introduction of the presbyterial system. The principal journal of "Young Bulgaria," under the leadership of the "Makedonia" of Slavejkov, supported the party of progress. After long and animated debates the Church assembly declared in favor of the participation of the laity in the administration of the affairs of the Church, the establishment of the salaries of the higher and the lower clergy, and the exclusive application of all surplus of ecclesiastical taxes to the elevation of popular instruction and the establishment of higher schools. It was decided also, by a vote of 28 to 15, that the exarch should be appointed, not for life, but for a term of five years. The place where he should reside was left an open question, almost equally strong reasons being presented in favor of his residence at Constantinople and in one of the large towns near the center of the exarchate. The discussion of the draft of the Church Constitution was finished on May 26, and it was presented to Ali Pasha by three deputies of the assembly—Hadshi Ivantshov, Pentchov Gyordaki, and Dr. Tchomakov. The Greek Patriarch, supported by the diplomatic influence of Russia, came again forward in opposition to the Sultan's well-intended measures for his Bulgarian subjects, with the demand that the Bulgarian Greek Church conflict should not be regarded as an administrative question, but as one of canon law, and that it should be left to the exclusive decision of an œcumenical council. He protested against all the acts of the Bul-

garian National Assembly as uncanonical and unconstitutional. In the contemplated œcumenical council the patriarchate would be sure of a majority. The few Bulgarian bishops would be easily silenced by the numerous Hellenic bishops of the Greek Churches of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Cyprus, and the continued Hellenization of the Bulgarian people would even receive the canonical approbation of the council, against which, as the Patriarch had said in a letter (November 4, 1870) to Ali Pasha, there is no appeal. In the meantime, however, the Patriarch Gregory VI. had laid himself open to censure by his undissembled animosity against the Slavic people and his opposition to the commands of the Turkish Governments. Abandoned by the Governments of Russia and Servia, he had no alternative but to accept the suggestion of Ali Pasha, and resign the patriarchate. Antim Kutalianus succeeded him on the 18th of September. Being of a more conciliatory disposition than his predecessor, he sought, as early as October, to engage in negotiations with influential Bulgarians for a compromise of difficulties. These negotiations have been of a more conciliatory character, but from what has transpired respecting them they do not seem likely to allay the long-increasing division in the Church. Antim insists upon giving the patriarchate control of the appointment of the Bulgarian exarch, upon the levy of a tax of a piaster upon each Bulgarian household, and upon the repeal of the tenth section of the Sultan's firman, which permits districts with a mixed population of Greek and Bulgarians to be attached to the Bulgarian exarchate upon the vote of the majority. The opposition of the patriarchate to this paragraph is easily explained, since it threatens it with a serious loss of moral and material power—a loss which it is not well able to bear since the Servian and the Roumanian Churches have been cut off from their dependence upon it. On the other hand, it is natural that the Bulgarians should insist upon its being retained, as its operation will be to promote the continual growth of their exarchate in territory and power. Members of the Bulgarian National Assembly, among them the deputies from Adrianople, Rustchuk, etc., and the Bulgarian community at Constantinople, have protested earnestly against further continuance of the negotiations with the Patriarch on this basis, to which he adheres obstinately. The decision on the whole subject, however, rests solely with the Porte.

A new conflict between the Bulgarians and the Patriarchate arose when, at the festival of Epiphany, 1872, three Bulgarian bishops, in order to show their independence, celebrated mass, in spite of the prohibition of the Patriarch, in the Bulgarian Church of Constantinople. The patriarch on the next day made a full report of the occurrence to the Turkish Government, which exiled the three Bishops. He also called a meeting of the great National Council, to which he explained the facts in the case and read the report. The Council resolved to publish a proclamation to the nation and to distribute it all over the country. The Bulgarians were not agreed as to the best course to be now pursued. The Young Bulgarians insisted on the immediate rupture of all negotiations with the

patriarchate, and applied to the Porte for the immediate appointment of a Bulgarian exarch. With this request the Porte, however, declined to comply. The more moderate party among the Bulgarians lamented the acts of the three bishops, and demanded the continuation of the negotiations with the patriarchate.

Soon, however, the Turkish Government was prevailed upon to take, once more, sides with the Bulgarians. In February, 1872, a decree of the Grand Vizier proclaimed that the Turkish Government, in consideration of the efforts of the Œcumenical Patriarchate to bring on splits between the Greek and the Bulgarian population, which the Porte had endeavored to prevent, would now establish the Bulgarian exarchate in accordance with the imperial firman. The responsibility for this measure would wholly rest with the patriarchate by which it had been provoked. It is also announced that a new Bulgarian Church Congress will assemble in Constantinople to carry out the provisions of the imperial firman.

An important reform in the Greek Church is the introduction, within the two last years, of a system of annual conferences, having in view the elevation of clerical life. These conferences are now held in all the dioceses. Among the younger clergy, who have received their education in the newer and better schools, and at the Academy, there are many who insist, with more or less determination, upon a thorough reform of the arbitrary canons of the Church, upon a higher culture of the clergy, and an improvement of their material condition. According to the new plans devised by the Russian Government for the appointment of the lower clergy, their consecration will not hereafter be wholly in the hands of the diocesan bishops, but candidates will be required, previous to receiving an appointment, to pass an examination regarding their fitness for the office.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Old Catholic Church.—During the three months which have elapsed since our last notice of the Old Catholic Church, ("Methodist Quarterly Review," January, 1872, p. 145,) the movement has attracted comparatively little attention. In this respect the history of the infancy of the new Church greatly differs from that of the origin of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century. It has not swept like a tempest over the Catholic world, carrying with it whole countries and provinces. Not a single district has wholly identified itself with the movement, and only a few parish priests have been able to carry the majority of their congregations with them. With the exception of a few Oriental bishops, who, soon after the close of the Council, declared against the new doctrine of the Papal Infallibility, only one bishop of the Catholic world, the eloquent Bishop Strossmeyer of Sirmium in Croatia, appears to withhold his submission, and even with regard to him, the course he will pursue in future is doubtful. Some of the other bishops who were outspoken opponents of the new doctrine while the Council was in session, but who have now published it in their dioceses, appear even now to lament the adoption of the new doctrine, and to be reluctant to

deal harshly with the Old Catholics. But no bishop in Europe has yet been found willing to place himself at the head of the new movement; and thus the large number of congregations which have been organized still have to do without those rites which, in the opinion of the Catholic Church, only bishops can perform. The negotiations with the Jansenist bishops of Holland and the Greek bishops of Russia have not yet sufficiently advanced to obtain from them the provisional exercise of the episcopal functions. Most of the State Governments remain undecided as to the course which they intend to pursue. The Government of Bavaria adheres to its former policy to regard Old Catholic priests and congregations as members of the Catholic Church; but the Emperor of Austria, according to a recent cable dispatch, has declared that in Austria the Old Catholics will no longer be regarded as belonging to the Catholic Church.

It must not, however, be inferred from the comparatively quiet history of the new Church that it has lost ground, or that it is on the point of dying out. It has, so far as we know, not lost an inch of ground which it had gained three months ago. None of its congregations have disbanded, but a number of new ones have been organized. One prominent French writer against Papal Infallibility, Abbé Gratry, has sent in his submission; but a considerable number of priests have joined the movement during the last three months. Dr. Döllinger, who is now rector of the University of Munich, uses his influential position for eloquent and learned addresses in support of the principles which have led to the establishment of the Old Catholic Church. Father Hyacinthe, who is as earnest as ever in the advocacy of the new movement, has published, in reply to Abbé Gratry, a statement of the reasons which prevent him from following the example of the latter. A proof of the liberal spirit which animates most of the prominent men of the Old Catholic Church may be found in the fact that Father Hyacinthe recently addressed a Protestant congregation in the city of Rome on the Bible. All the other prominent men of the movement remain unshaken in their convictions. Several distinguished members of the new Church, as Professor Balzer, a distinguished theological writer, and canon of the Cathedral Church of Breslau, Professor Zenggcr, of the law faculty of the University of Munich, and Sister Lassaulx, late superioress of a Catholic convent in Bonn, and belonging to a celebrated Catholic family of Germany, have proved the firmness of their faith on their deathbeds. A very interesting literature continues to be published by the Old Catholic professors of Germany against the unfounded pretensions of the Pope, and widely undermines the belief in an infallible pope, as it is not and cannot be refuted by the papal writers. The Catholic lay professors of the German universities are nearly unanimous in their sympathy with the movement. The municipal authorities of many of the large cities, as Vienna and Munich, are outspoken and firm supporters of the Old Catholics, to whom they transfer churches and schools whenever it is in their power to do so. The new Church has not only the sympathy and support of hundreds of political and literary papers, but it also has several organs which are wholly devoted to it. Even in Rome such a periodical has of

late been established. In Spain about sixty priests have declared in favor of a similar movement. In France a canon of the Cathedral of Paris has established a central committee to organize the Church throughout France. Thus there is progress in many quarters. The leaders are extremely careful as regards the completion of their organization by the election of bishops; but erelong they will be compelled to take the decisive step. In the meanwhile two of the leaders, Professor Friederich, of the University of Munich, and Professor Michelis, of Braunsberg, have been invited to St. Petersburg, in order to study the organization of the Greek Church, and to enter into new negotiations for a union of the Oriental and the Old Catholic Churches.

◆

Art. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Among the many excellent works on the history of the Papacy which the important events of the last two years have called forth, belongs a history of the election of popes, by Dr. Zoepffel, repetent at the theological stift which is connected with the University of Göttingen, (*Die Papstwahlen*, Goettingen, 1871.) It treats, in particular, of the historical development of the election of the Popes, and the ceremonies connected with it, from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. It is divided into three sections, the first of which reviews the election of Popes from 1059 to 1274; the second, the introduction of the Pope into the Lateran; and the third, the enthronization of the Pope. A special appendix discusses the contested election of the year 1130, when Innocent II. and Anaclet II. were simultaneously elected by two opposing parties. With regard to this election, the author reaches the conclusion that neither of the two contestants were elected in a canonical manner, as the one lacked the qualities which were required for a legitimate election, while the manner in which the other (Innocent, whom the Church of Rome regards as the lawful Pope) was elected was contrary to custom, law, and stipulations. Professor Schulte, in Prague, who, before he became, in 1871. one of the leaders of the Old Catholics, was regarded as one of the highest authorities on all questions touching the canonical law, in a review of this work takes the ground that, according to the provisions of the canonical law, Anaclet II., whom the Church of Rome rejects from the list of Popes as an Anti-pope, was undoubtedly the lawful Pope. Professor Schulte, in his review of the book, remarks that it discusses a number of questions relating to the election of Popes for the first time, and that such is the candor and the thoroughness with which all points are investigated, that most of them may be regarded as having been settled by the author forever. The book in general is represented as one of those which fully exhaust their subject, and supersede the whole previous literature.

A valuable work on the religion and worship of the pagan systems before Christ has been published by the learned Catholic theologian, Karl

Werner, (*Die Religionen und Culte des vorchristlichen Heidenthums.* Schaffhausen, 1871.) In an introductory part the author classifies all the writers on pagan religions according to the stand-point from which they have written. The main part of the work is divided into three "books," the first of which treats of the religions and gods of the ante-Christian paganism; the second, of the origin and substance of the religious myths of paganism; the third, of the relation of the pagan religions to the Christian revelation.

Conrad von Orelli, a young professor of the University of Zurich, has published an interesting pamphlet on the Hebrew Synonyms of Time and Eternity, (*Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit.* Leipzig, 1871.) The pamphlet is dedicated by the author to two of the most celebrated German Orientalists, Delitzsch and Fleischer, whose pupil he is. A second pamphlet by the same author discusses the national character of the Old Testament religion, (*Der nationale Character der alttestamentlichen Religion.* Zurich, 1871.)

The Manual of Church History, by Alzog, the best work of the kind in the literature of the Roman Catholic Church, appears at present in a ninth, revised edition. The first volume is out, and the second, which will complete the work and continue the history of the Church until the beginning of 1872, will appear in the course of the present year. (*Handbuch der Universal Kirchengeschichte.* Mentz, 1872.)

All those who are interested in Oriental languages will welcome a brief but complete history of the Syriac literature which Professor Bickell, of Munster, has recently published in the Latin language, (*Conspectus rei Syrorum literariæ.* Munster, 1871.) In ten sections the author treats of the Syriac translations of the Bible, of the translation of the apocryphal books, of the orthodox authors, of the heretical writers, of the translations of the Greek Church fathers, of the translations of Greek heretical writers, of the non-theological literature of the Syrians, of the liturgies, of the ritual books, and lastly, of the breviaries.

ITALY.

The contributions of Italy to the theological literature of the Roman Catholic Church are few, and in general they are specimens rather of new paradoxical views than of theological learning. A new commentary on the Apocalypse, by Professor Cenesa, (*L'Apocalisse*, 2 vols. Genova, 1871,) represents the time from 500 to 1500 as the Millennium; the rise of the Reformation in the 16th century denotes the beginning of the final struggle of Satan against the Church, which will last 500 years. Then, 2000 years after Christ, follows the renovation of all things, the golden age, in which the nations of the world will fraternize with the universal monarchy of the Pope, who is called the "Vice-Christ." The harbingers of this renovation of all things are the dogmatization of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope. The present power of Germany is the victory of Magog, to which the arms of Italy will soon make an end, in order to bring on the golden age under the rule of Rome.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

An Examination of Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 12mo., pp. 427. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1872.

Canon Liddon's book was recommended to the readers of our Quarterly in a former number in very high terms—terms which we would most emphatically reiterate—as an unrefutable defense not only of the divinity of Christ but of the divine origin of Christianity. Yet we freely acknowledge that, so far as the former point is concerned, Mr. Liddon is here encountered by a champion worthy of his steel. The clergyman writes in a chaste severity of style, with a keen logic, a close exegesis, and a thorough mastery of the latest literature of the subject. Whoever wishes to study a masterly argument in opposition to the Godhead of Messiah, will find it in this volume. There are but two or three points to which we will state our exceptions.

There is a moral equivocality in the position of the writer's entire argument to which we think a delicate conscience feels a very just repugnance. His position is, that the divinity of Christ is a doctrine unsusceptible of valid proof from the Scriptures, yet validly sustainable by the authority of the Church, provided that authority be accepted as decisive. By the mere forms of his statement he is still able to deny that he has at all opposed the dogma of the Trinity; he has only shown whence, if anywhere, the dogma must draw its decisive proof. Just so, though in a less ostentatious form, Hume appends to his essay on Miracles a profession that he writes for the purpose of basing the truth of Christianity on its true grounds. We certainly should dislike to see any defense of evangelical Christianity shaped in terms of such doubtful sincerity.

The book contains some sad sentences touching upon the moral propriety of a denier of Christ's divinity signing the Thirty-nine Articles and occupying a place in the Anglican ministry. It seems to us that it is a peculiar conscience that professes devoutly to worship in the words of the English liturgy, and yet believes that Jesus Christ is but a glorified man.

The doctrine of the right of private judgment and freedom from tradition is, we think, for the purpose of the argument, stated in extreme terms. While, on the one hand, we do not concede to any body of men, in the present or past, calling itself a Church, to prescribe our creed, it does not follow that no respect is to be

paid to "the catholic Church, the communion of saints." Though church authority be not our master, the voice and spirit of the Church may be a powerful *aid* in shaping our faith. In interpreting a passage of Scripture, verbally susceptible at the present moment of two or three meanings, we do not stand precisely in the same position as if no other interpreter ever preceded us. There ever has been a body of holy Christian thinkers, whose study of the Bible has been most reverent and most ardent, whose zeal for a pure Christianity has been most consuming; in whom the image of Christ has been most transparently revealed, through whom the blessed Spirit has most sensibly breathed to us—martyrs, confessors, reformers, missionaries, saints—who have read these texts before us, and their *consensus* is not quite as worthless as a blank silence. Their great body was TRINITARIAN. Our Protestant heart and head reads the Bilbe, we confess, with a profound sympathy with that great central Church which so plainly had the mind of Christ. On the contrary, we speak it in no unkind spirit, on the outskirts of the Church of the Holy, doubtful whether within or without, there ever has been a marginal body of thinkers; and they have ever questioned whether or not Christ were truly divine. That outskirt body, as near as we can judge, would never have existed as a body but for the Church they have environed. They derive all their life, as an adjunct, from the orthodoxy they antagonize. But for Trinitarianism there would be distinctively no Unitarianism.

So far as the argument is concerned, nevertheless, flinging all churchly authority out of account, we think Mr. Liddon is far from being confuted. The argument against the primitive worship of Christ is, especially, a failure.

Systematic Theology. By CHARLES HODGE, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 648. Vol. II, pp. 732.

In the lieu of any notice of our own, for the present, we substitute the critique of Dr. Hodge's Theology from the "British Quarterly," the organ of the English Independents:

> This large octavo volume is occupied with a comparatively small portion of the vast field of systematic theology. The Rev. A. A. Hodge, the son of the present author, published, ten years ago, a work entitled "Outlines of Theology," which has enjoyed a well-deserved reputation for succinct exposition of the leading features of the evangelical theology as conceived by the Princeton divines. That work was confessedly to a very large extent based upon the theological lectures of the author's father, popularized and compressed into the form of question and answer. We have before us the first installment of those life-long labors which have secured for Dr. Hodge the esteem and reverence of theological students on both sides of the Atlantic. The great outline is filled in somewhat unsymmetric-

ally; for example, the introduction consists of chapters on "Method," "The Nature and Divisions of Theology," "Rationalism," "Mysticism," and the "Roman Catholic and Protestant Rules of Faith." The chapter on mysticism spreads out into an historical excursus on mystics of more than forty pages, while no corresponding space is given to the history of the intellectual tendencies which have provoked the reaction of mysticism. No sketch is given of the forms in which dogmatic theology grew into a system, nor any general estimate of patristic, scholastic, Anglican, or Puritan divinity. The author asserts, on very meager grounds, the position of the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture, and makes it identical with plenary inspiration. The question of the canon, which on this theory is one of peculiar difficulty, is dismissed in a page. The antitheistic theories are discussed with ability, and great space is given to the scientific materialism which the author regards as the stronghold of atheism. Great use is made of Professor Huxley's able refutation of some of the leading principles of Comte's positive philosophy, and vehement protest is entered against the correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces. The chapter on the "Knowledge of God" is a valuable criticism of the theory of Sir W. Hamilton. There is much interesting discussion of the great Church doctrine of the Trinity, and the author shows where the Nicene fathers go beyond the standard of their own creed in their attempt to explain the nature of the relation between the Father and the Son. He maintains that while the decisions of the Council have been accepted by the Church universal, the speculations of the Nicene fathers have not. The doctrine of divine decrees is described, but at no great length; it is discriminated from fatalism, and freed from some objections. The treatment of the doctrines of creation, providence, miracles, and angels complete the volume. The whole forms an interesting digest of a portion of a vast theme; it is written with extreme lucidity and calm confience, and will be useful to theological students. It is not overdone with learned lumber, but states forcibly and simply the leading points of the various controversies that accompany all human speculation on the deep mysteries of the Godhead and of our relation to the divine being. It is confined to theology proper. The development of anthropology, soteriology, eschatology, and ecclesiology are, we presume, reserved for succeeding volumes.

◆

The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version, (A.D. 1611.) With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. I. Part 1. Genesis–Exodus. 8vo, pp. 928. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1871.

Some seven years ago the proposal was made by Mr. Denison, Speaker of the English House of Commons, to have a Commentary on the Bible prepared by a selected body of scholars, adapted to the wants of the public mind of the present day; and because of this not very original or profound suggestion the work has been entitled the "Speaker's Commentary." Some of the best English biblical scholars of the Establishment were engaged upon the work, and the entire Pentateuch has appeared as the first installment. The general editor, Canon Cook, is the author of a not remarkable Commentary on the book of Acts, but his part of the work in the present volume exhibits scholarship and ability. The other contributors, Dr. E. Harold Browne, Rev. Samuel Clark, and Rev. T. Espen, are not well-known names in this country.

The entire volume promises well for the enterprise. It is written in a clear, neat, modest style, stays within the limits of comably; for example, the scholastic [illegible] of [illegible] on "[illegible]," the Nature and [illegible] of [illegible] Catholic and Protestant [illegible] "Mysticism," and the "[illegible]" an historical [illegible] ing space is given to the [illegible] of the [illegible] the question of mysticism. [illegible] theology [illegible] Aquinas, [illegible] position of the [illegible] [illegible] inspiration. The [illegible] peculiar [illegible] with [illegible] regards as the [illegible] able refutation [illegible] vehement protest [illegible] tal fathers. The [illegible] theory of Sir W. Hamilton. There is a most interesting [illegible] Church doctrine of the Trinity; and the author shows [illegible] beyond the standard of [illegible] the relation between the Father and the Son. [illegible] sions of the Council [illegible] of the Nicene fathers [illegible]. The doctrine of the [illegible] at no great length; it is [illegible] them. The treatment of the doctrine of [illegible] completes the volume. The whole forms [illegible] theme; it is written with [illegible] to theological [illegible] cally and clearly the [illegible] all [illegible] the divine being. It is [illegible] pology, [illegible] succeeding volumes.

The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611). With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. I. Part I. Genesis—Exodus. 8vo., pp. 498. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1871.

Some seven years ago the proposal was made by Mr. Denison, Speaker of the English House of Commons, to have a Commentary on the Bible prepared by a selected body of scholars, adapted to the wants of the public mind of the present day; and because of this not very original or profound suggestion the work has been entitled the "Speaker's Commentary." Some of the best English biblical scholars of the Establishment were engaged upon the work, and the entire Pentateuch has appeared as the first installment. The general editor, Canon Cook, is the author of a not remarkable Commentary on the book of Acts, but his part of the work in the present volume exhibits scholarship and ability. The other contributors, Dr. E. Harold Browne, Rev. Samuel Clark, and Rev. T. Espin, are not well-known names in this country.

The entire volume promises well for the enterprise. It is written in a clear, neat, modern style, keeps within the limits of modmentary proper, avoids homiletics, and is very little animated with any glow of devout feeling. It is conservative and evangelical, maintaining with quiet firmness the established views of the sacred canon, where no decisive proof requires a change. Besides the running notes on the sacred text, there is furnished a number of dissertations on the more difficult problems, in which much skill and erudition are employed in elucidating the doubtful points, in meeting skeptical objections, and especially in solving the new difficulties which modern science has created. In these respects it is the most thorough, learned, systematic, and, on the whole, most satisfactory Commentary on the Pentateuch that has been furnished in the English language. We therefore very heartily welcome and recommend it.

◆

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Physiology of the Soul and Instinct, as distinguished from Materialism. With Supplementary Demonstrations of the Divine Communication of the Narratives of Creation and the Flood. By MARTYN PAINE, A.M., M.D., LL.D., Professor in Medical Department of the University of New York, etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 707. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Dr. Paine has for many years sustained a high reputation as a thinker and writer in medicine, philosophy, and natural science. His Institutes of Medicine has been formerly noticed in our Quarterly as the leading advocate of its school of therapeutics, and a permanent standard among the medical profession. As a scientist, he holds the existence of a vital principle, as well as of an immaterial thinking agent, to be scientifically demonstrable. The present volume is an incorporation into a single system of his views, hitherto presented in scattered forms, of science and philosophy in their relations to the highest hopes of man.

He opens his volume with several chapters demonstrating the existence of Soul in opposition to Materialism. He next claims to refute not only the identity of physical forces with the mind, but even wholly denies the modern theories of the correlation of forces. The physiological part of the subject is then finished with several chapters in refutation of the doctrine of spontaneous generation, and the overthrow of pantheism.

The remaining half of the volume is devoted to cosmogony, in which our author claims to refute the assumptions of modern geology to be a science. He denies, and claims to overthrow, not only the doctrine of the immense antiquity of the human race, but the antiquity of the earth itself. The Mosaic history of the creation mentary proper, avoids homiletics, and is very little colored with any glow of devout feeling. It is conservative and evangelical, maintaining with quiet firmness the established views of the sacred canon, where no decisive proof requires a change. Besides the running notes on the sacred text, there is furnished a number of dissertations on the more difficult problems, in which much skill and erudition are employed in elucidating the doubtful points, in meeting skeptical objections, and especially in solving the new difficulties which modern science has created. In these respects it is the most thorough, learned, systematic, and, on the whole, most satisfactory Commentary on the Pentateuch that has been furnished in the English language. We therefore very heartily welcome and recommend it.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Physiology of the Soul and Instinct, as distinguished from Materialism. With Supplementary Demonstrations of the Divine Communication of the Narratives of Creation and the Flood. By Martyn Paine, A.M., M.D., LL.D., Professor in Medical Department of the University of New York, etc. etc. 8vo., pp. 707. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Dr. Paine has for many years sustained a high reputation as a thinker and writer in medicine, philosophy, and natural science. His Institutes of Medicine has been formerly noticed in our Quarterly as the leading advocate of its school of therapeutics and a permanent standard among the medical profession. As a scientist, he holds the existence of a vital principle, as well as of an immaterial thinking agent, to be scientifically demonstrable. The present volume is an incorporation into a single system of his views, hitherto presented in scattered forms, of science and philosophy in their relations to the highest hopes of man.

He opens his volume with several chapters demonstrating the existence of Soul in opposition to Materialism. He next claims to refute not only the identity of physical forces with the Mind, but even wholly denies the modern theories of the correlation of forces. The physiological part of the subject is then finished with several chapters in refutation of the doctrine of spontaneous generation, and the overthrow of Darwinism.

The remaining half of the volume is devoted to cosmogony, in which our author claims to refute the assumptions of modern geology to be a science. He denies, and claims to overthrow, not only the doctrine of the immense antiquity of the human race, but the antiquity of the earth itself. The Mosaic history of the creation, he defends as absolutely true according to the literal construction. The creative week consisted of six days, of twenty-four hours each, measuring from the first creation of mundane matter to the first Sabbath. This discussion is performed, not with a fine and finished rhetoric; not always, indeed, with a correct and lucid English style; but in a strain of bold and manly argument, with a wide mastery of scientific literature, an abundance of quotations from the leading and latest authors whom he courteously but uncompromisingly opposes; all of which is presented as the result of years of study and research, not only in the professional "easy chair," but in the open fields spread out by nature for man's direct investigation. How far his staunch claims to having accomplished so extended a series of *demonstrations* are valid, we leave to the persevering student of his pages to decide.

With modern scientism the problem is how to account for the system of things without a God. With Dr. Paine the postulate, at start, is a designing power, co-operating with and controlling natural agencies, not only as a reverent but as a *necessary* assumption in order to any valid solution. Omnipotent intelligence, he tells us, first brought matter into existence, with its affinities and forces, in a state of dense solution—a chaos. Upon its dark surface the quickening Spirit brooded, impregnating it with vitalizing power, and then overspreading it with light. A directive volition, blending with natural forces, then concentrated the chaotic elements into solid land, as described by Moses, heaving them up into mountains and hills, spreading them into plains, and leaving fissures, vales, and vast basins for rivers, lakes, and oceans. In this process the crystalline rocks, forming the great body of the earth's crust, were formed. The vital power meanwhile brought forth animal life in a truly infinite profusion and variety. And as from these great revolutions the sedementary rocks were gradually forming in various localities, rapidly yet gradually, animal forms were imbedded in infinite numbers in the plastic strata, resulting in the fossils of modern paleontology. No one knows in what intensity the vital power then poured forth the myriads of life; not only forming rapid coral reefs in their amazing profusion, but mammoths, mastodons, and magatheria in stupendous magnitudes.

Who made the crystal rocks? They form the solid framework of the cosmos. Yet the chemist can no more construct a block of granite than the physiologist can organize a living man. It is a lost art, exercised only in the creative week, the only artist God.

he defends as absolutely true according to the literal construction. The creative week consisted of six days, of twenty-four hours each, measuring from the first creation of mundane matter to the first Sabbath. This discussion is performed, not with a fine and finished rhetoric; not always, indeed, with a correct and lucid English style; but in a strain of lucid and manly argument, with a wide mastery of scientific literature, an abundance of quotations from the leading and latest authors whom he courteously but unconquerably opposes; all of which is presented as the result of years of study and research, not only in the professional "easy chair," but in the open fields spread out by nature for man's direct investigation. How far his staunch claims to having accomplished so extended a series of demonstrations are valid, we leave to the persevering student of his pages to decide.

With modern scientists the problem is how to account for the system of things without a God. With Dr. Paine the universe, at start, is a designing power, co-operating with and controlling natural agencies, not only as a reverent, but as a necessary assumption in order to any rational solution. Omnipotent intelligence, he tells us, first brought matter into existence, with its affinities and forces, in a state of dense solution—a chaos. Upon its dark surface the quickening Spirit brooded, impregnating it with vitalizing power, and then overspreading it with light. A chemical volition, blending with natural forces, then concentrated the chaotic elements into semi fluid, as described by Moses, heaving them up into mountains and hills, spreading them into plains, and hollowing fissures, vales, and vast basins for rivers, lakes, and oceans. In this process the crystalline rocks, forming the great body of the earth's crust, were formed. The vital power meanwhile brought forth animal life in a truly infinite profusion and variety. And as from these great revolutions the sedimentary rocks were gradually forming in various localities, rapidly yet gradually, animal forms were imbedded in infinite numbers in the plastic strata, resulting in the fossils of modern paleontology. No one knows in what intensity the vital power then poured forth the myriads of life; not only forming rapid coral reefs in their amazing profusion, but mammoths, mastodons, and megatheria of stupendous magnitudes.

Who made the crystal rocks? They form the solid framework of the cosmos. Yet the chemist can no more construct a block of granite than the physiologist can organize a living man. It is a lost art, exercised only in the creative week, the only artist God.

Even uniformitarian Lyell, who proudly affirms that creation has ever been shaped by causes and processes now in visible operation, pauses here, and yields confession that no known laws or causes solidified the chaos into this adamantine order. The scientist can no more tell how the primal rocks were made than how matter was created or life originated; that is, he knows how every thing is created—except—creation.

And as for the nebular theory, it is argued to be an inevitable chemical necessity that an indiscriminate, undesigned vapor, consisting of sixty-three simple elements, should, on cooling, result in *nothing but a promiscuous heap!* The symmetrically designed forms, the exquisitely organized systems, the intricate yet intellective contingencies and varieties of living nature, have no possible logical congruity or sympathy with the pure, unintelligent fortuity of a crude nebula. They are two contrasted, contradictory conceptions, incapable of being translated into each other, incapable of concretely resulting either from the other. A universal nebula, beginning in unintelligence, must logically end in unintelligence. To suppose that this unintelligent mist latently embosoms in itself a future magnificent universe of intelligential systems is imbedding in that mist a perpetual effect demanding a perpetually non-existing cause; that is, a potential intellective system without an intelligent author. No matter how far you carry back into past ages of nebula the inclosed ideal system, mind must precede it.

It is indeed a fundamental argument with atheists, as Hume and Büchner, that it is as easy to conceive an eternal material organism, to wit, *the world*, as an eternal mental organism, to wit, *a God.* If you ask, *Who made the world?* they retort, *Who made God?* If you reply, *God is eternal*, they retort, *Then why not the world eternal?* Let both then, we reply, be eternal. Still both experience and intuition affirm that organized matter is subordinate to mind; that organized matter is mind-molded matter; and that mind is prior and superior, so that the eternal organism requires an eternal organizing Intelligence as its anterior, superior, and cause. But when you really have the intelligent Power as a necessary eternal conception, matter is no longer needed to be other than empirical and contingent. Why suppose two necessary, self-existent, eternal postulates when one will do?

But in the nebular hypothesis our author finds unconquerable physical difficulties. As the nebula cools through ages down a little lower than two thousand degrees Fahrenheit all the gold in

the world becomes a solid metal. During ages after all the gold has solidified the nebula is cooling down to eight hundred, when tellurium becomes a solid; and then not until ages after, at six hundred, all the mercury has subsided from vapor. And yet we find that *these three substances actually exist combined in a native amalgam.* If the world came by this natural cooling process the solid gold would never admit the vapory tellurium and mercury into its impenetrable substance; nor would gravitation permit that the lighter substances should be present when the gold was solidifying. And in numberless instances our author maintains that systematized combinations have emerged from the supposed nebular mass not to be explained by natural law, and bearing all the traits of systematic design. In short, a system of blind laws cannot make a rational world.

Dr. Paine maintains the absolute universality of the biblical Deluge; finds the ark ample enough for all the demands of modern science, and structural enough to attest the wisdom of ancient art. Assuming a reasonable amount of supernatural control, with a rational boundary line between the miraculous and the natural, he holds the flood not only as credible, but as accounting for all the geological phenomena not assignable either to the creative week or the natural course of time and events. Particularly for the coal formations he finds the ordinary solutions of geologists ludicrously inadequate; and he elaborately maintains that our coal beds are really the forests swept by the flood-wave from their native localities northwestward, until lodged in stupendous vales and gorges, and then overwhelmed with minerals and earth by the return flood. From which it would certainly follow, that, however damaging its first occurrence, we of the present day are highly obliged to the Noachic flood. Whether our author is sound or not, he is unquestionably learned and ingenious. We suppose our *savans* will unceremoniously assign him to the same shelf with former biblical cosmogonists, Granville Penn, Fairholme, and Ure.

Half Truths and the Truth. Lectures on the Origin and Development of Prevailing Forms of Unbelief, Considered in Relation to the Nature and Claims of the Christian System. By J. M. MANNING, D.D., Pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, and Lecturer on the Relations of Christianity to Popular Infidelity at Andover Theological Seminary. 12mo., pp. 398. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Dr. Manning's title page is the obscurest page of his book. It employs a deal of circumlocution to avoid telling his readers that he has given us a survey of pantheism, historical and analytical,

exposing its demoralizing effects on the public mind at the present hour. His modesty, of course, prevents his telling us that he has performed this work learnedly, clearly, and powerfully. His style is very transparent, and his temper amiable and liberal. His book is a very valuable key to much of the present demoralization of the public heart. He traces the genealogy of the most refined infidelity now reigning, and auspicates its results. Under the light of his historic lamp it would be well for many of our public thinkers and popular writers to ascertain from what they were born, who, what, and where they are, and whither they, and we with them, are tending.

The Moses of this great pantheistic dispensation was that wonderful Jew, Baruch Spinoza. When the slumbers of Europe, under the opiates of tradition and authority, were first breaking in the seventeenth century, one of the earliest wakers and awakeners of others was Descartes. The clear eye of Descartes plainly saw that truth and falsehood were terribly mixed in the public beliefs, and that a separation was an absolute necessity. His instrument for working this separation was this postulate: *Reject every thing as false of which a doubt can be entertained, and what you will have left will be pure certainty.* He then began, in his own mind, with a clean slate, first blanking his mind of every belief, and then admitting every belief, one by one, bearing the certificate of absolute indubitability. His first step was to argue his own existence from his own consciousness—*I think, therefore I am.* At this very first step, however, Baruch arrests him under the authority of his postulate, and says, Consciousness only gives the *think*, but does not give any *I.* We are thus forever shut up into consciousness; all things exist only in mind. Sensations, perceptions, by which outside things were heretofore supposed to be known, are only modifications of mind, and of any thing outside of mind we can know nothing. The outer world, God, all, alike exist only in the *ego.* Transition is then made to the assumption —we say not how logically—that the All is one great *Ego*, of which my consciousness is but a little phenomenon; and all consciousnesses are

Diverse like the billows, but one like the sea.

One would think, however, that the true result would be for my consciousness to assert its own single and sole existence. If what we call God and nature exist not at all externally, but as modifications of my mind, how is it that man or men, outside of myself, with their imagined consciousnesses, have any real exter-

nal existence? Every other man's consciousness is but a modification of my consciousness, and so has no real existence. The logic that thus destroys the personal existence of God destroys the personal existence of every individual man—but myself.

With great clearness and beauty Dr. Manning traces the history of pantheistic thought from Spinoza, through its interruptions by the sense-systems of Locke, exaggerated by the sensualism of Condillac, to its re-appearance as an exaggeration of Kantianism by Fichte and Schelling; next, its esthetic form by Goethe, and its hero-worshiping spasms in Carlyle, and last, its self-idolatry in Emerson. Its abolition of the true God, and substitution of a spontaneous Nature in his stead, is exposed in its true light as a main source of our present moral enervation and the prevalence of sensuality and violence. That natural spontaniety legitimatizes every impulse, consecrates every lust, and authorizes every crime as the true acting out of the divinity of nature. Away with the obsolete distinctions of right and wrong, abolish law, let nature unfold herself in her true freedom. Free love, free religion, free appropriation of all available funds, and free use of the pistol and the dagger are the practical outflow of this godless philosophy. This base prostitution of the word *free* is precipitating us into anarchy—the too sure prelude to subsequent despotism. It is Christianity alone, with her God of holiness, in, yet above nature, her stern moral law vindicated by the sanctions of eternal retribution, and her great renovating agencies, which stands as the only hope of the age.

These lectures are a very interesting blend of the historical with the theoretical, and may be very specially recommended to the study of all our ministers who would obtain a true key to our present state of mind and morals.

Pantheism is the identification of God with nature. There is no deity but cosmos. Of that infinite One every *thing* is a part and every *event* is an unfolding. As well the chair on which you sit, and the knife wherewith you sharpen your pencil, are God, as the stars by night or the sun by day. It is not simply that God is IN these; for that is simply affirming the omnipresent efficiency of God: it means that he IS these. If we mistake not Dr. Manning sometimes fails of carefully retaining this distinction, and finds a suspicionable pantheism where it does not exist. When Pope affirms that God

> Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
> Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees,

ual existence? Every other man's consciousness is but a modification of my consciousness, and so has no real existence. The logic that thus destroys the personal existence of God destroys the personal existence of every individual man—but myself.

With great clearness and beauty Dr. Manning traces the history of pantheistic thought from Spinoza, through its interruption by the sense-systems of Locke, exaggerated by the sensualism of Condillac, to its re-appearance as an exaggeration of Kantianism by Fichte and Schelling; until its æsthetic form by Goethe, and its hero-worshiping species in Carlyle, and last, its self-deifying in Emerson. Its abolition of the true God, and substitution of a spontaneous Nature in his stead, is exposed in its true light as a main source of our present moral excitation and the prevalence of rascality and violence. That natural spontaneity legitimates every impulse, consecrates every lust, and authorizes every crime as the true acting out of the divinity of nature. Away with the obsolete distinctions of right and wrong, stylish laws, let nature unfold herself in her true freedom. Free love, free religion, free appropriation of all available funds, and free use of the pistol and the dagger are the practical outflow of this godless philosophy. This base prostitution of the word *free* is predisposing us to anarchy—the too sure prelude to subsequent despotism. It is Christianity alone, with her God of holiness, far, yet above nature, her stern moral law vindicated by the sanctions of eternal retribution, and her great renovating agencies, which stands as the only hope of the age.

These lectures are a very interesting blend of the historical with the theoretical, and may be very specially recommended to the study of all our ministers who would obtain a true key to our present state of mind and morals.

Pantheism is the identification of God with nature. There is no deity but cosmos. Of that infinite One every thing is a part and every event is an unfolding. As well the chair on which you sit, and the knife wherewith you sharpen your pencil, are God, as the stars by night or the sun by day. It is not simply that God is in them; for that is simply affirming the omnipresent existence of God; it is that he is them. If we mistake not, Dr. Manning sometimes fails of carefully retaining this distinction, and finds a reprehensible pantheism where it does not exist. When Pope affirms that God

Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees,

we have a beautiful expression of an omnipresent omnipotence. But when Emerson says,

> He *is* the axis of the star,
> He *is* the sparkle of the spar,

the true pantheistic fetichism is naked before us. We thence know that not only the "axis of the star" but the axle-tree of a butcher's cart, and the blade of a boy's jack-knife, are all Emerson's *god.* If then real worship is to be performed, the African's "mumbo-jumbo" is its true object.

We have one serious fault to find with Dr. Manning. We do not complain that he is too amiable, but we complain that with gentle exceptions he is too exclusively amiable. We think Goethe, the debauchee, should not be let off under a drapery of euphemisms. We wish he had given us a lecture on the pre-eminent moral responsibility of the theorist of crime over that of the criminal himself. A murderer is bad enough, but he is a prattling innocent compared with the soft-spoken sophist who broaches the doctrine by which thousands of murderers are made. The courtesy in the parlor, the amiableness in the family circle, are scarce mentionable apologies for the man from whose philosophy-shop are taken out the licenses for debauchery and outrage.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The History of Israel. By HEINRICH EWALD. Translated from the German. Edited, with a Preface and Appendix, by RUSSELL MARTINEAU, M. A. Second edition. Revised and Continued to the Commencement of the Monarchy. Two vols., 8vo. 1869. Vol. III. The Rise and Splendor of the Hebrew Monarchy. Vol. IV. From the Disruption of the Monarchy to its Fall. Edited by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M. A. London; Longmans, Green & Co. 1871.

These four volumes are a translation of only a part (three vols. in the German) of Ewald's great work *Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* The German work contains (including a volume on the antiquities of the Israelitish people) five volumes more, and brings the history down into the Christian era, to the final dispersion of the Jews. The author is widely known as one of the most eminent Orientalists and Biblical scholars of Germany. Born at Göttingen in 1803, he was educated at the Gymnasium and University of his native town, and in his twentieth year, on leaving the University, he published his first work, *Die Komposition der Genesis kritische untersucht,* a work that has long held a respectable place among critical dissertations on the first book of the Bible. He afterward became Professor of Oriental Languages in the

University of Göttingen, and has published many learned works, among the most important of which are his Arabic and Hebrew Grammars, and a translation and exposition of the poetical and prophetical books of the Old Testament. In many respects his *History of Israel* is his greatest work, and, notwithstanding his rationalism, dogmatism, and contempt of those who differ from him, this work cannot be overlooked by any scholar who attempts a thorough scientific study of Hebrew literature.

According to Ewald, tradition is the beginning and native soil of all history; and under the plastic power of memory and imagination original facts and stories become greatly changed, in the course of time, by the ever-varying repetitions through which they pass; and when at length they find their way into written documents the record is at best only a colored picture of the ancient fact. Hence the many discrepancies in the narratives of the Bible. "A story essentially the same, and sprung from *one* occurrence, is multiplied by successive changes in the details into two or more discordant narratives, which, being produced in different places, and then subsequently brought together, finally appear as so many different events, and as such are placed beside one another in a book."—Vol. i, p. 16. Thus Abraham's passing off his wife for his sister before Pharaoh, (Gen. xii,) and again before Abimelech, (Gen. xx,) and the similar conduct of Isaac on a later occasion, (Gen. xxvi,) are only different traditions of one and the same event. But songs, proverbs, proper names, visible monuments and institutions, aid tradition, and when a whole mass of material has become too great for the memory easily to retain, there comes the natural tendency to connect events and persons together, and interpolate transitions from one to the other, so as to make out a coherent whole. And such was the origin of the historical books of the Old Testament. So the province of the student of these histories is to distinguish between the tradition as recorded and its foundation, detect the interpolations of later times, and discern through all what were the remote facts of the ancient time from which all these traditions and written records gradually arose.

In accordance with this theory Ewald goes on in his *Introduction* (which fills most of the first volume) to give what he regards as the true history of Hebrew historical composition. He places the historical books of the Old Testament in three great divisions. 1. THE GREAT BOOK OF ORIGINS, (including the Pentateuch and Joshua.) 2. THE GREAT BOOK OF KINGS, (Judges, Ruth, University of Gottingen, and has published many learned works, among the most important of which are his Arabic and Hebrew Grammars, and a translation and exposition of the poetical and prophetical books of the Old Testament. In many respects his *History of Israel* is his greatest work, and, notwithstanding its rationalism, dogmatism, and contempt of those who differ from him, this work cannot be overlooked by any who desire to make a thorough scientific study of Hebrew literature.

According to Ewald, tradition is the beginning and source of all history; and under the plastic power of memory and imagination original facts and stories become greatly distorted in the course of time, by the ever-varying repetitions through which they pass; and when at length they find their way into written documents the record is at best only a colored picture of the ancient fact. Hence the many discrepancies in the narratives of the Bible. "A story essentially the same, and sprung from one occurrence, is multiplied by successive changes in the details into two or more discordant narratives, which, being produced in different places, and then subsequently brought together, finally appear as so many different events, and as such are placed beside one another in a book."—Vol. i, p. 16. Thus Abraham's passing off his wife for his sister before Pharaoh, (Gen. xii,) and again before Abimelech, (Gen. xx,) and the similar conduct of Isaac on a later occasion, (Gen. xxvi,) are only different traditions of one and the same event. But songs, proverbs, proper names, visible monuments and institutions, aid tradition, and when a whole mass of material had become too great for the memory easily to retain, there came the natural tendency to connect events and persons together, and interpolate transitions from one to the other, so as to make out a coherent whole. And such was the origin of the historical books of the Old Testament. So the province of the student of these histories is to distinguish between the tradition as recorded and its foundation, detect the interpolations of later times, and discern through all what were the remote facts of the ancient time from which all these traditions and written records gradually arose.

In accordance with this theory Ewald goes on in his *Introduction* (which fills most of the first volume) to give what he regards as the true history of Hebrew historical composition. He places the historical books of the Old Testament in three great divisions: 1. THE GREAT BOOK OF ORIGINS, (including the Pentateuch and Joshua;) 2. THE GREAT BOOK OF KINGS, (Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings.) 3. LATEST BOOK OF GENERAL HISTORY, (Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, to which was afterward added Esther.) But neither of these great divisions was the work of one author or of one age. The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua are a compilation from the works of at least eight different authors, whose particular composition and age of writing Ewald's critical instinct can discover and portion off with remarkable nicety. He decides that the work received substantially its present form from an author who wrote in Egypt about the latter half of King Manasseh's reign, but the greater portion of the Book of Origins was written by a contemporary of Solomon. For this writer Ewald confesses the highest admiration. "Lofty spirit! thou whose work has for centuries not irrationally had the fortune of being taken for that of thy great hero Moses himself, I know not thy name, and divine only from thy vestiges when thou didst live, and what thou didst achieve; but if these thy traces incontrovertibly forbid me to identify thee with him who was greater than thou, and whom thou thyself only desiredst to magnify according to his deserts, then see that there is no guile in me, nor any pleasure in knowing thee not absolutely as thou wert!"—Vol. i, p. 96.

The second division named above is handled in the same way. Numerous authors and compilers are detected, and the conclusion reached that the final collector and editor flourished during the latter part of the Babylonish captivity, and after the death of King Jehoiachin. The third division is assigned to the early years of the Greek dominion, and was probably written about the time of Alexander's death. The Book of Esther was written still later, and admitted into the Canon solely for its account of the feast of Purim. It is far removed from the spirit of the old religion, and "through the entire narrative the author avoids, as if by design, mentioning the name of God; either because the story was addressed to minds unwilling to be reminded of higher names and things, or rather that he himself remains to the end true to the same low view of things in which the general plan and spirit of the festal story took its rise."—P. 197.

With this view of the origin and character of the sacred books, we know at once what to expect of Ewald when he proceeds from his *Introduction* to treat in detail the history of the Israelitish people. All the addresses of Moses and Joshua to Israel, all the grand songs of the olden Hebrew literature, were composed ages after the time of the persons and events to which the Bible

Samuel, and Kings.) A Lesser Book of Hebrew History, (Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, to which was afterward added Esther.) But neither of these great divisions was the work of one author or of one age. The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua are a compilation from the works of no less than eight different authors, whose particular composition and age of writing Ewald's critical instinct can discover and portion off with remarkable nicety. He decides that the work received subsequently its present form from an author who wrote in Egypt about the latter half of King Manasseh's reign, but the greater portion of the Book of Origins was written by a contemporary of Solomon. For this writer Ewald expresses the highest admiration. "Lofty spirit! thou whose work has for centuries not irrationally had the fortune of being taken for that of thy great hero Moses himself, I know not thy name, and divine only from thy vestiges when thou didst live, and what thou didst achieve: but if these thy traces incontrovertibly forbid me to identify thee with him who was greater than thou, and whom thou thyself only desirest to magnify according to his deserts, then see that there is no guile in me, nor any pleasure in knowing thee not absolutely as thou wert!"—Vol. I, p. 80.

The second division named above is handled in the same way. Numerous authors and compilers are detected, and the conclusion reached that the final collector and editor flourished during the latter part of the Babylonish captivity, and after the death of King Jehoiachin. The third division is assigned to the early years of the Greek dominion, and was probably written about the time of Alexander's death. The Book of Esther was written still later, and admitted into the Canon solely for its account of the feast of Purim. It is far removed from the spirit of the old religion, and "through the entire narrative the author avoids, as if by design, mentioning the name of God; either because the story was addressed to minds unwilling to be reminded of higher names and things, or rather that he himself remains to the end true to the same low view of things in which the general plan and spirit of the festal story took its rise."—P. 197.

With this view of the origin and character of the sacred books we know at once what to expect of Ewald when he proceeds from his *Introduction* to treat in detail the history of the Israelitish people. All the addresses of Moses and Joshua to Israel, all the grand songs of the oldest Hebrew literature, were composed ages after the time of the persons and events to which the story refers them. All miracles are myths and legends of a credulous age. All prophecies were written after the events which they foretell. And he who ventures to assail the positions of this Corypheus among critics may expect a contemptuous handling, if indeed he is honored with any reply at all. Even the works of such a rationalist as Knobel are set down as "unsatisfactory and perverse," and "the opinions of such as Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Keil, and Kurtz, stand below and outside of all science."—P. 64. With such specimens of his treatment of other critics and scholars, it is idle for the editor to attempt, as he does in the Preface, to defend Ewald against the charge of "excessive dogmatism." For critical and philological discussions, and numerous suggestions of unquestionable value, this work must long hold a high place among the most important contributions to the study of the Old Testament; but with all evangelical scholars, Ewald's methods of dislocating and re-arranging the Old Testament books will be regarded as fanciful, violent, unscientific, and worthless. M. S. T.

Memorials of Methodism in Virginia, from its Introduction into the State in the year 1772 *to the year* 1829. By Rev. WILLIAM W. BENNETT, D.D., Editor of Richmond "Christian Advocate." 12mo., pp. 741. Richmond, 1871.

After having, with Dr. Redford, ranged the "dark and bloody ground" of Kentucky pioneer Methodism, we are led back by Dr. Bennett to the old Virginia homestead. On the ancient field, in fuller detail, we fight the old ancestral battles over again. The dim forms of the original heroes—Williams, Asbury, Shadford, John Easter, Philip Gatch, Devereux Jarratt, etc., move before us. The early reapers gathered a rapid, golden harvest. The great body of the population were Church of England people, whose souls the shepherds did not feed; and when our preachers came among them as in fact living and earnest Churchmen, the prepossession was in their favor, and thousands of hearts that were ready for a more living religion answered at once to their call. They had not, as in New England, to encounter a field pre-occupied by a stern piety, or to fight a theological battle with Calvinistic metaphysics. It was naked, indefensible wickedness they had to encounter, and they carried the day by an onslaught.

Virginia Methodism and the great family of Methodism owe thanks to Dr. Bennett for gathering from the memories of old survivors, from accessible manuscripts, and from the journals of the Virginia Conference, the fading matter of their "memorials." Happily, the work was done before our late civil war, for an un-

portant share of his material was consumed in the Richmond conflagration.

Opportunely for a pending discussion, Dr. Bennett has furnished a fuller account of the early schism in Maryland and Virginia on the subject of the ordinances than elsewhere exists. A review of its interesting events will serve to show what value was placed by our fathers on the subject of Wesley's episcopal *ordination*, and will aid us in deciding whether we have swerved from the primitive ground, and in ascertaining who it is that is endeavoring to introduce "a new *credo*" into Methodism.

When, in 1772, the first Conference was held in Virginia, the entire body of preachers held themselves, under Mr. Wesley, as true members of the Church of England, simply bent on raising a "society" of zealous Christians within its pale. Had pious Devereux Jarratt been in the place of Bishop Madison, with a body of like-minded clergy, Virginian Methodists would all have been zealous "prelatical" Churchmen; but, quite the reverse, the entire clergy of that section amply showed by their abounding profligacy that the most right-lined ordination was no sure channel of the grace of God. The Methodist converts widely refused to accept the communion and baptism at their hands. The Conference of that year, therefore, unanimously agreed in prohibiting every preacher from "administering the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper," and in strictly exhorting "the people to attend *the Church* and receive the ordinances there." Yet in Maryland the eloquent Strawbridge, and soon after in Virginia the devoted and heroic Philip Gatch, were leaders in the popular movement. In the Conference of 1775 they were in an apparent majority, and it was with difficulty that Asbury and the other leaders could induce them to postpone action to the Conference following. It was a pressing case. In large sections there was no ordained minister, and not a child could be baptized, not a communion administered, nor even the funeral rites be performed for the dead. At each successive Conference the question arose until the session of 1779, from which Asbury was absent and the movement prevailed. A brief Methodist Presbyterian Church was extemporized.

During all this time Francis Asbury, under the title of "General Assistant," was Wesley's representative in America. Coke says he had "for many years exercised every branch of the episcopal office except that of ordination." And at this time probably Asbury and the Conference generally believed that it was perfectly competent for them, if they saw it for the best, to organize a

Church, perform ordinations, and administer the sacraments. They were perfectly competent to establish two or three grades of ministry, with or without ordination. They were competent to establish three grades, with or without ordination, and call it an Episcopal Church. All this Asbury and his comrades refused to do. They preferred to remain under John Wesley's advice, and finally determined to accept an ordained episcopacy from his hands.

At this Conference of 1779 four elders, with Gatch at their head, were selected, who ordained each other, and then ordained others, and authorized the administration of the ordinances. Asbury and a number of preachers held soon after a counter session, and a division was fairly inaugurated. The next year (1780) there were two opposition Conferences, one of the seceding Presbyterians and one of the Episcopals. To the latter, being the earlier, Gatch and Ellis came, but were treated coldly as seceders After much discussion they accepted Asbury's proposition to *postpone the ordinances for one year.* A delegation consisting of Asbury, Watters, and Freeborn Garrettson, visited the Presbyterian Conference, and were very lovingly received. They were good and true men, these Presbyterian Methodists. They had experienced glorious revivals meantime, and pointed to their rich successes as proofs of the blessing of God upon their secession; yet all had not been smooth. Many of the people refused their administration of ordinances. Some of their preachers, in disapprobation, left for the North, where the entire movement was condemned. Their proceedings, if successful, would have split, and perhaps ruined, the young Church. Asbury, when admitted to their Conference, read Wesley's Thoughts against Separation from the Church, and made his argument against the Presbyterian movement. For two days the seceders stood firm, and finally yielded, rather under the glow of fervent prayer than the force of argument, to compromise by *ceasing the ordinances until Mr. Wesley could be consulted.* Up to this time, we suppose, Mr. Asbury and his coadjutors had no other intention than to remain "prelatists" as "a society" in communion with the Anglican Episcopal Church.*

It took four years, until 1784, for Wesley to come to the "ordination" point. He had asked Bishop Lowth to confer the ordination for him, but providentially the refusal of the elegant prelate

---

* Traces of this fact long remained in our popular language. As late as 1830 we heard the phrases "the society," "join the society," "turned out of the society," sometimes with the definite article omitted.

saved us from being handed over to "prelacy." At length Wesley performed what we showed in our last Quarterly to be the boldest act of his life. He ordained Coke and two elders, and sent them to America with "letters of episcopal orders," and then, for the first time, the Conference was "satisfied with the validity of their ordination," and people and preachers bounded at once into a joyful unanimity. Wesley sent over his form for three co-ordinate ordinations, containing no intimation that either of the three was less an ordination, or less conferred an order, or *was less life-tenured*, than the other.

The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Founder of the Methodists. By Rev. L. TYERMAN, author of "The Life and Times of Rev. S. Wesley, M. A." In three volumes. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 563. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

We are not able to express a high degree of pleasure at the republication in this country of a life of Wesley, which cannot be accepted on either side of the Atlantic by Methodists as a standard. It may relieve the matter somewhat if, as we see it announced, Dr. Stevens is to furnish some corrective annotations. We could wish the corrections had commenced with the present volume, and even with the title-page. We acknowledge John Wesley as the founder of Methodism, of the Methodist Societies and Church, but never knew before that he founded "the Methodists" themselves. But Mr. Tyerman is a great revealer of new facts, and we cheerfully record that he has written a live and readable book.

We are to thank Mr. Tyerman, moreover, for bringing before us in this first volume important and decisive facts touching the pending discussion on Mr. Wesley's views of episcopacy as an "order" after his reading of Lord King's "Inquiry," and consequently his views of the episcopate he founded in America.

Mr. Wesley read Lord King's treatise in the year 1746, and thus recorded his consequent conclusions: "In spite of the vehement prejudices of my education I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draft; but if so, it would follow that BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS ARE ESSENTIALLY OF ONE ORDER, and that originally every Christian congregation was a Church independent of all others."

Consequent upon this, Mr. Wesley's Conference in the next year, 1747, records his opinion on the same subject in the following questions and answers:

Q. Are the THREE ORDERS, of BISHOPS, PRIESTS, and DEACONS, plainly described in the New Testament?

A. We think THEY ARE, and believe THEY GENERALLY OBTAINED *in the Churches of the apostolic age.*

Q. But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all Churches in all ages?

A. We are *not* assured of this, because we do not know it is asserted in the Holy Writ.

Q. If this plan were essential to a Christian Church, what must become of all the foreign reformed Churches?

A. It would follow that they are no parts of the Church of Christ! A consequence full of shocking absurdity.

Q. Must there not be numberless accidental varieties in the government of various Churches?

A. There must, in the nature of things, for, as God variously dispenses his gifts of nature, providence, and grace, both the offices themselves and the officers in each ought to be varied from time to time.

Q. Why is it there is *no determinate plan* of Church government *appointed* in Scripture?

A. Without doubt, because the wisdom of God had a regard to this necessary variety?

These records are conclusive. They prove that, *in consequence of reading Lord King*, Mr. Wesley embraced and held as harmonious in his mind these two positions: "Bishops and presbyters are essentially of ONE ORDER," and "The three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons are plainly described in the New Testament, and they generally obtained in the apostolic age." We say not now (we have stated our view of it in our October Quarterly, pp. 675–677,) how his own mind reconciled these two positions. All we now affirm is, that he held them both as consistent parts of his theory of Church government. At any rate, in one aspect he held that bishops and elders are one order; in another he held they were two. *He held, therefore, that an ordained episcopate is an order.*

Let us, therefore, present the following harmony of early opinions:

1746–47. "Bishops and presbyters are essentially of *one order.*"—*Wesley.*	1747. "The *three orders* of bishops, priests, and deacons are described in the New Testament," and "generally obtained in the Apostolic Church."—*Wesley and his British Conference.*
1784. "Lord King's account of the primitive Church convinced me many years ago that BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS ARE THE SAME ORDER."—*Wesley's Letter to the American Conference.*	1789. "Wesley . . . set apart . . . Thomas Coke . . . having delivered to him letters of EPISCOPAL ORDERS." "The General Conference . . . did unanimously receive the said T. C. and F. A. as their *bishops*, being *satisfied of the validity* of their EPISCOPAL ORDINATION."—*American General Conference.* "The form and manner of making and ordaining of superintendents, elders, and deacons."—*Wesley's American Ritual.*

On this we may note that if the maintenance of three orders (meaning thereby successionally ordained ministerial grades, constitutionally established and constitutionally removable by the Church) is *prelacy*, then Mr. Wesley, both in 1747 and in 1784, was a prelatist; the British Conference and the American General Conference were prelatists; our Discipline, and therefore our ordinations, are prelatical; our episcopacy is a prelacy, our bishops are prelates, and our Church is prelatical. We are all "high Church," and always have been from our founders until now.

We present to our readers, also, the following harmony:

In whatever sense distinct ordinations constitute distinct orders in the same sense Mr. Wesley certainly intended we should have three orders, for he undeniably instituted three distinct ordinations. All the forms and solemnities requisite for the constituting of any one order in this sense were equally prepared and recommended by him to us for the constituting of three orders. The term *ordain* is derived from the Latin *ordino*, to order, to create, or commission one to be a public officer, and this from *ordo*, order; and hence persons *ordained* are said to be persons in "holy orders." And the degree of ordination stated in the "commission," or letters of ordination, shows the degree of the orders.—*Emory's Defense.*

In regard to the proper nature of "orders" we said in our article, p. 526, "How can there be an ordination if not to an order?" This question embraces an entire argument. The old verbs to *ordain* and to *order* were different forms of the same word, used in the ritual of the Anglican Church, of which Wesley was a presbyter; to *order* signifies to endow with *orders*, just as to magnetize signifies to endow with magnetism, and so Webster rightly defines "ordinations in the Episcopal Church as the act of conferring holy *orders* or sacerdotal power, called also consecration." The word had this import because, to the mind of the Church, the thing had this nature. *Ordination* was the mode and test of an *order*. As an Anglican Churchman Mr. Wesley's mind was shaped to the assumption that a valid ordination always conferred valid orders. Although the word *order* is an ecclesiastical rather than a scriptural term, and is of very flexible import, yet the best definition we can give it would be thus: *Order is a rank of ministry constituted by election and ordination, permanently and successionally continued in a Church.* Our episcopate would *thus* be an order.—*October Quarterly.*

It is perfectly clear that *under our definition of an order* Emory affirms that Wesley intended three orders. It will also be seen that we regard *election* as conditional to a valid episcopate of any particular Church. Mather was ordained by Wesley as *bishop*, but, receiving no election, he was, at any rate, no bishop of any particular Church. Asbury was both elected and ordained, and so was the bishop of the Church that elected him.

At Last: A Christmas in the West Indies. By CHARLES KINGSLEY. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 465. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

After forty years of anticipation, as he declares, the author of this book "at last" left his English home, and spent seven weeks in the island of Trinidad, one of the British West Indies. Every page shows that Mr. Kingsley is an enthusiastic lover and student of nature. Nothing escapes his quick eye. The people of various races, the plains, the mountains, the forest, the sea, the exuberant tropical vegetation, the multiform animal life, all meet due attention. He was industrious in seeing, and in recording what he saw. He describes, in never-ceasing wonder, scenes that were so new and strange to him that at times it seemed as if they were not real, and if he were only to close his eyes for a few seconds, and "wink hard," all would vanish, and he would find himself at home again. Truly, the transition from latitude 50° to latitude 10° in December, was not a small one. The book is a good one, full of information, full of vivid descriptions of novel scenes and novel things, indicating on every page that it is the work of an observant, thoughtful, cultured mind. A map, and a few statistical statements, would make it still more valuable. With much of accurate, minute description, there is a lack of clear, strong outline. C.

◆

The Ancient History of the East: From the Earliest Times to the Conquest by Alexander the Great; including Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Asia Minor, and Phœnicia. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A., author of the History of the World. Illustrated by engravings on wood. 12mo., pp. 649. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The entire results of modern discoveries in the burial remains of the ancient nations of the earth are nowhere so compactly collected and summarily presented as in this volume. Although the earliest chronology is still a vexed question, yet this volume has a powerful evidential value in behalf of the Old Testament. Its synchronisms are striking. It is wonderful that the little race of Jews were chosen to be the historiographers of the world. While the registries of the proudest nations of antiquity have been buried from sight, and even now are traceable but in scattered fragments, the clear, consecutive Hebrew history has been the light of the world.

This volume, connected with Dr. Smith's History of the Old Testament, forms an historic commentary well worthy of the use of the biblical student. The density with which the facts are packed together renders *study*, repeated *study*, rather than mere *reading*, necessary, in order to a full mastery of the vast subject.

At Last: A Christmas in the West Indies. By CHARLES KINGSLEY. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 469. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

After forty years of anticipation, as he declares, the author of this book "at last" left his English home, and spent seven weeks in the island of Trinidad, one of the British West Indies. Every page shows that Mr. Kingsley is an enthusiastic lover and student of nature. Nothing escapes his quick eye. The people of various races, the plains, the mountains, the forest, the sea, the exuberant tropical vegetation, the multiform animal life, all arrest due attention. He was industrious in seeing, and in recording what he saw. He describes, in never-ceasing wonder, scenes that were so new and strange to him that at times it seemed as if they were not real, and if he were only to close his eyes for a few seconds, and "wink hard," all would vanish, and he would find himself at home again. Truly, the transition from latitude 50° to latitude 10° in December, was not a small one. The book is a good one, full of information, full of vivid descriptions of novel scenes and novel things, indicating on every page that it is the work of an observant, thoughtful, cultured mind. A map and a few statistical statements, would make it still more valuable. With much of accurate, minute description, there is a lack of clear, strong outline.

G.

The Ancient History of the East. From the Earliest Times to the Conquest by Alexander the Great; including Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Asia Minor, and Phœnicia. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A., author of the History of the World. Illustrated by engravings on wood. 12mo., pp. 622. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The entire results of modern discoveries in the buried remains of the ancient nations of the earth are nowhere so compactly collected and summarily presented as in this volume. Although the earliest chronology is still a vexed question, yet this volume has a powerful evidential value in behalf of the Old Testament. Its synchronisms are striking. It is wonderful that the little race of Jews were chosen to be the historiographers of the world. While the registries of the grandest nations of antiquity have been buried from sight, and even now are traceable but in scattered fragments, the clear, consecutive Hebrew history has been the light of the world.

This volume, connected with Dr. Smith's History of the Old Testament, forms an historic commentary well worthy of the use of the biblical student. The density with which the facts are packed together renders study, repeated study, rather than mere reading, necessary, in order to a full mastery of the vast subject.

Miscellaneous.

Threescore Years and Beyond; or, Experiences of the Aged. A Book for Old People, describing the Labors, Home Life, and Closing Experiences of a large number of Aged Representative Men and Women. Illustrated edition. By W. H. De Puy, D.D. Royal 8vo., pp. 512. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

Pillars in the Temple; or, Sketches of Deceased Laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church distinguished as examples of Piety and Usefulness. Chronologically Arranged. By Rev. William C. Smith. With an Introduction by C. C. North. Large 16mo., pp. 366. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

Life and Labors of Mrs. Maggie Newton Van Cott: the First Lady licensed to Preach in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. By Rev. John O. Foster. With an Introduction by Rev. Gilbert Haven, Editor of "Zion's Herald," Boston, and Rev. David Sherman. 12mo., pp. 339. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872.

Light on the Pathway of Holiness. By Rev. L. D. M'Cabe, D.D. 16mo., pp. 114. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

Spiritualism Identical with Ancient Sorcery. New Testament Demonology and Modern Witchcraft, with the Testimony of God and Man against it. By W. M'Donald. Large 16mo., pp. 212. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

The Annihilation of the Wicked Scripturally Considered. By Rev. W. M'Donald. Large 16mo., pp. 99. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

The Last Gladiatorial Show. By John T. Short. 12mo., pp. 283. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

Christ in the Soul; or, Illustrations of Some of the Principles and Experience which Characterize Christ's Spiritual or Inward Coming and Indwelling. By Thomas C. Upham. 12mo., pp. 173. New York: W. C. Palmer, Jr. 1872.

First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth. Essays on the Church and Society. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. 12mo., pp. 364. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1871.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by Rev. John M'Clintock, D.D., and James Strong, S.T.D. Vol. IV. H I J. Large 8vo., pp. 1113. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Short Studies on Great Subjects. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. Second Series. 12mo., pp. 472. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

The Poetry of the Hebrew Pentateuch. Being Four Essays on Moses and the Mosaic Age. By Rev. M. Margoliouth, M.A., LL.D., Ph.D., etc. 12mo., pp. 146. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1871.

Lenten Sermons. By Paul Segneri. Volume I. 12mo., pp. 362. New York: Catholic Publishing House. 1872.

The Complete Phonographer: Being an Inductive Exposition of Phonography, with its Application to all Branches of Reporting, and affording the Fullest Instruction to those who have not the assistance of an Oral Teacher. Also, intended as a School-book. By James E. Munson. 12mo., pp. 236. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Rameses the Great; or, Egypt Three Thousand Three Hundred Years Ago. Translated from the French of F. De Lanoye. 12mo., pp. 296. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Music and Morals. By Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A. 12mo., pp. 478. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration, and Adventure. Japan in Our Day. Compiled and Arranged by Bayard Taylor. 12mo., pp. 280. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

A Manual of Composition and Rhetoric. A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By John S. Hart. Fourth Edition. 12mo., pp. 380. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. 1872.

First Lessons in Composition. By John S. Hart, LL.D. 12mo. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1872.

A Manual of English Literature. A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By John S. Hart, LL.D. 12mo., pp. 636. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1872.

Spectrum Analysis. Three Lectures. By Professors Roscoe, Huggins, and Lockyer. 16mo., pp. 146. New Haven, Conn.: C. C. Chatfield & Co. 1872.

Light. By Jacob Abbott. With numerous engravings. 12mo., pp. 313. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Æsthetics; or, The Science of Beauty. By John Bascom. 12mo., pp. 268. New York and Chicago: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co. 1872.

Half-Hours with Modern Scientists: Huxley, Barker, Stirling, Cope, Tyndall. 12mo., pp. 288. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield & Co. 1871.

Shakspeare's History of King Henry VIII. Edited, with Notes, by William J. Rolfe, A.M. With engravings. 12mo., pp. 207. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

The Rise and Fall of the Paris Commune in 1871. With a Full Account of the Bombardment, Capture, and Burning of the City. By W. Pembroke Fetridge. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 516. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The August Stories. By Jacob Abbott. Volume II. Hunter and Tom. 12mo., pp. 383. New York: Dodd & Mead.

The Land of Desolation. Being a Personal Narrative of Observation and Adventure in Greenland. By Isaac I. Hayes, M.D. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 357. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Lucretius on the Nature of Things. Translated into English Verse. By Charles Frederick Johnson. With Introduction and Notes. 12mo., pp. 333. New York: De Witt C. Lent & Co. London: Sampson, Low, & Marston. 1872.

Water and Land. By Jacob Abbott. With numerous engravings. 12mo., pp. 330. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Bede's Charity. By Hesba Stretton. 12mo., pp. 311. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.

Yesterdays with Authors. By James T. Fields. 12mo., pp. 352. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872.

Twenty Years Ago. From the Journal of a Girl in her Teens. Edited by the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." 12mo., pp. 354. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Little Sunshine's Holiday. A Picture from Life. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." 16mo., pp. 210. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Woman's Worth and Worthlessness. The Complement to "A New Atmosphere." By Gail Hamilton. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Wilfred Cumbermede. An Autobiographical Story. By George Macdonald, Author of "Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood," "Alec Forbes," "Robert Falconer," etc. With 14 full-page Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 498. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

The Adventures of Oliver Twist. By Charles Dickens. With 28 Illustrations by F. Mahoney. 8vo., pp. 171. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Correction.—The phrase "we denounce," attributed in our last Quarterly to the Editor of the "Pittsburgh Christian Advocate,' we find on referring really to have been "we pronounce." The sentence as thus read was peremptory enough, but not discourteous, and does not sustain certain sentences and turns of expression which were based by us upon it, and which, with gratification, we hereby withdraw.

METHODIST
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1872.

ART. I.—HOMER AND HIS ENGLISH TRANSLATORS.

[FIRST ARTICLE.]

AMONG the anomalies of literature none, perhaps, is more remarkable than the circumstance that the most ancient productions of the human intellect are precisely those which, at the present day, attract the greatest attention. While the works of successive generations of philosophers and historians have perished—while the very names of the poets of later, and, as we call them, more cultivated ages, have well-nigh sunk into oblivion—the poems of the earliest writers, both sacred and profane, gather rather than lose interest in the eyes of the world. In fact, never were the poetical merits of the magnificent hymns of the Hebrew psalmist, or the lays of the early Greek minstrel, more carefully investigated or more fully appreciated than now, twenty-six or twenty-eight centuries after their first composition. Confining our attention to the latter class of productions, we are compelled to seek for the secret of this striking fact in something else than religious feeling; for not only do these venerable relics of extreme antiquity come down to us unhallowed by religious associations, but their entire tone and character is diametrically opposed to the system of truth which we profess; a fact so patent, that the early Christians felt themselves called upon to discourage, if not to forbid, their study. Nor was this strange. To the primitive Christians

they were the sacred books of an abhorred theology with which they were daily warring. If to us the myths of Jupiter and Apollo are legends so transparently false that we read them with as much indifference as we peruse a pleasing fairy tale whose incongruities forestall deception, to *them* they assumed the proportions of real life, while the figures became genii or demons, the very embodiment of the principle of evil.

We may undoubtedly discover one cause of the growing interest felt in the productions of Homer in unsatisfied curiosity. The world is as yet by no means certain that it has solved the intricate problem of their origin. The very suggestions that have been made with the view of removing its difficulties only augment them. Concede, if you will, that the Iliad was composed as a series of ballads, by different minstrels, and without the aid of writing. You have then rendered it still more incomprehensible that such uniform excellence of style, and such singular similarity of versification, should have been possessed in common by a large number of rhapsodists, living, perhaps, far apart in time and place.

Without, however, desiring to deny that a good part of the interest felt in Homer has an antiquarian or purely historical basis, we may safely assert that it is not all, nor indeed the greater part, of the truth. It is the intrinsic merits of the great poet that constitute and will ever constitute his chief attraction. " John," wrote that inimitable letter-writer, Cowper, to a youthful correspondent—" John, once the Little, but now almost the Great, and promising to be altogether such in time, make yourself master of the Iliad and of the Odyssey as soon as you can, and then you will be master of two of the finest poems that ever were composed by man, and composed in the finest language that ever man uttered. All languages of which I know any thing are gibberish compared with Greek." Without indorsing in its most literal sense the last assertion, we may safely say that Cowper's estimate is also that of every unprejudiced reader, who, having so mastered the tongue in which they are written as to find in the diction no serious drawback to his thorough appreciation of its beauties, can throw himself into the Iliad and Odyssey with somewhat of the *abandon* of those who first drank in with avidity their glowing verses.

It is not strange, therefore, that there has been little lack either of imitations or of translations. All our ideas of the epic poem are derived from Homer; and all languages upon which that of Greece has exerted a sensible influence possess epic poems, of which the greatest merit is often not their originality, but the closeness with which they have copied their model. Virgil, Dante, and Milton, not to mention a host of lesser lights, derive much of their brilliancy from this central luminary. Their conception of unity as applied to time, place, and the general management of the plot, as indeed all the more important points of the poem, are evidently drawn from this source. Much of this influence is certainly unconsciously exercised, but it is none the less substantial. A part of it comes from the study of Homer himself, or of those who modeled their poems on his; while much reaches them through Aristotle, whose laws for the composition of an epic poem are all of them the result of a careful examination of the principles that seem to have guided Homer.

Numerous as have been the imitators of Homer, the number of his translators has naturally been far larger. Not a few writers of the first class have condescended to the task of rendering into their own native tongues the lays which moved the wonder of the untutored peasantry of Greece in the early dawn of history. To say that marked success has been rare even at the hands of such gifted men is, nevertheless, only to utter the unvarnished truth. A few there have certainly been who not only entertained a just and adequate conception of the office of the translator, but also possessed the natural endowments necessary to reach the high standard they had formed for themselves. Of this number was Johann Heinrich Voss, equally eminent as a philologist and as a poet, who produced what is perhaps the most exact metrical version ever made. This marvel of erudition and of ingenuity presents to the German reader the very counterpart of Homer's original. The verse is the dactylic hexameter. Every line of the translation corresponds to that of the Greek. Scarcely an expressive epithet is wanting or misplaced.

We have, however, at present to do only with the English translators of Homer, and in English we have until recently had no such version. It may be in part the fault of our En-

It is not strange, therefore, that there has been little lack either of imitations or of translations. All our ideas of the epic poem are derived from Homer; and all languages upon which that of Greece has exerted a sensible influence possess epic poems, of which the greatest merit is often not their originality, but the closeness with which they have copied their model. Virgil, Dante, and Milton, not to mention a host of lesser lights, derive much of their brilliancy from this central luminary. Their conception of unity as applied to time, place, and the general management of the plot, as indeed all the more important points of the poem, are evidently drawn from this source. Much of this influence is certainly unconsciously exercised, but it is none the less substantial. A part of it comes from the study of Homer himself, or of those who modeled their poems on his; while much reaches them through Aristotle, whose laws for the composition of an epic poem are all of them the result of a careful examination of the principles that seem to have guided Homer.

Numerous as have been the imitators of Homer, the number of his translators has naturally been far larger. Not a few writers of the first class have condescended to the task of rendering into their own native tongues the lays which moved the wonder of the untutored peasantry of Greece in the early dawn of history. To say that marked success has been rare even at the hands of such gifted men is, nevertheless, only to state the unvarnished truth. A few there have certainly been who not only entertained a just and adequate conception of the office of the translator, but also possessed the natural endowments necessary to reach the high standard they had formed for themselves. Of this number was Johann Heinrich Voss, equally eminent as a philologist and as a poet, who produced what is perhaps the most exact metrical version ever made. This marvel of erudition and of ingenuity presents to the German reader the very counterpart of Homer's original. The verse is the dactylic hexameter. Every line of the translation corresponds to that of the Greek. Scarcely an expressive epithet is wanting or misplaced.

We have, however, at present to do only with the English translators of Homer, and in English we have until recently had no such version. It may be in part the fault of our lan glish language, or our English ear, too intolerant of the interminable hexameter, in which alone the reproduction could be perfect; and it may also be in part owing to the lack of that patient study which characterized the German scholar to so remarkable a degree.

The list of English translators of Homer may with propriety be said to commence with George Chapman, whose literary reputation, long depreciated and sedulously decried, has only lately been restored to the position it seems entitled to occupy. Chapman was a finished scholar in the departments of study for which he showed any taste, while the invincible dislike he entertained for metaphysics and logic prevented him from acquiring a high standing in the university. Born in 1557, he was a *protégé* of Walsingham and a friend of Ben Jonson. As a writer of tragedy, he has left us several plays which are far above mediocrity. Indeed, Charles Lamb regards him as having probably more nearly approached Shakspeare in the descriptive and didactic passages of his plays than has any other among English dramatic writers. But it is not by his *Bussy d'Amboise*, but by his *Iliads*, that Chapman is best and most favorably known by us. Of the great Smyrnea bard he was an ardent admirer; and he seems long to have contemplated the translation which in the end he wrote hastily and never fully revised. It was, perhaps, unfortunate that for this purpose he chose the verse of fourteen syllables, whose inordinate length proved less pleasing to the ear of readers in later times than to that of his own contemporaries. Yet in the hands of such a master it became an instrument of no little power and dignity.

Among all the early translators, Chapman is entitled to the high praise of having most clearly comprehended the true function of his art. It was his ambition, consequently, not merely to present a picture more or less closely resembling the original which he copied, but to reproduce that original with strict accuracy down to the slightest details. To assert that he was always successful would be to claim for him an unerring eye and a hand capable of reproducing every stroke of the pencil of the great master. But thus much we can assert with confidence, that rarely has copyist more thoroughly grasped the thought, more successfully assumed the sentiments, of his glish language, or our English ear, too intolerant of the interminable hexameter, in which alone the reproduction could be perfect; and it may also be in part owing to the lack of that patient study which characterized the German scholar to so remarkable a degree.

The list of English translators of Homer may with propriety be said to commence with George Chapman, whose literary reputation, long depreciated and studiously decried, has only lately been restored to the position it seems entitled to occupy. Chapman was a finished scholar in the departments of study for which he showed any taste, while the invincible dislike he entertained for metaphysics and logic prevented him from acquiring a high standing in the university. Born in 1557, he was a *protégé* of Walsingham and a friend of Ben Jonson. As a writer of tragedy, he has left us several plays which are far above mediocrity. Indeed, Charles Lamb regards him as having probably more nearly approached Shakspeare in the descriptive and didactic passages of his plays than has any other among English dramatic writers. But it is not by his *Bussy d'Ambois*, but by his *Iliads*, that Chapman is best and most favorably known by us. Of the great Smyrnan bard he was an ardent admirer; and he seems long to have contemplated the translation which in the end he wrote hastily and never fully revised. It was, perhaps, unfortunate that for this purpose he chose the verse of fourteen syllables, whose inordinate length proved less pleasing to the ear of readers in later times than to that of his own contemporaries. Yet in the hands of such a master it became an instrument of no little power and dignity.

Among all the early translators, Chapman is entitled to the high praise of having most clearly comprehended the true function of his art. It was his ambition, consequently, not merely to present a picture more or less closely resembling the original which he copied, but to reproduce that original with strict accuracy down to the slightest details. To assert that he was always successful would be to claim for him an unerring eye and a hand capable of reproducing every stroke of the pencil of the great master. But thus much we can assert with confidence, that rarely has copyist more thoroughly grasped the thought, more successfully assumed the sentiments, of his master. Pope, with all his desire to depreciate one from whom he took so much without giving him due credit, was compelled to admit that Chapman's version was "like what one imagines Homer himself would have writ before he arrived at years of discretion." He might with greater justice have said, that it was like what Homer would have written had he composed his poem in English. What was so conspicuously wanting in Pope, Chapman certainly possessed in a high degree—that thorough sympathy with the Greek poet which enabled him to throw himself into his work with his whole soul. For Pope, with his scanty knowledge of the language in which Homer wrote, this was out of the question; but Chapman, uniting a thorough acquaintance with the idiom to a nice poetical taste, was able to interpret Homer as he has rarely been interpreted in English. The very eccentricity of his poetical rendering—that occasional insertion in an unauthorized manner of matter not found in the original—arises from the keenness of his appreciation of the master's meaning. In this case, certainly, vice is only virtue carried to excess. Let us take an instance from the sixth book of the Iliad. The brave and chaste Bellerophon, solicited by the Princess Antea, wife of King Prœtus, turns a deaf ear to her seductive words, and thereby incurs the anger and the calumnious accusations of the dissolute woman:

> *ἀλλὰ τὸν οὔτι*
> *πεῖθ' ἀγαθὰ φρονέοντα δαΐφρονα Βελλεροφόντην,*

says Homer simply.

> "But failed to move
> The upright soul of chaste Bellerophon,"

is Lord Derby's not altogether correct rendering. Here Chapman, grasping the full meaning of both epithets—of the *ἀγαθὰ φρονέοντα* and of the *δαΐφρονα* *—gives their exact equivalents,

---

* It scarcely needs to be remarked that Chapman discards that absurd dictum of the grammarians that *δαΐφραν* has the meaning of *warlike* in the Iliad, and of *prudent* in the Odyssey; alleging that the solitary exception is Iliad xxiv, 325, and regarding this exception as a confirmation of the opinion that the book in question is later than the rest of the poem. L. Dindorf's remark is just: "*Rectius Heyn. ad Il.*, xi, 123: Rejectis similibus *grammaticorum argutiis*, judicavit stabilium apud epicos epithetorum vim non nimis esse premendam." Note *s. v.* in Steph. Thesaurus, (Paris, 1837,) vol. ii. p. 870.

which he, wisely or unwisely, goes on next to expand after this fashion:

> "But he whom *wisdom* did inspire
> As well as *prudence*, (*one of them advising him to shun*
> *The danger of a princess' love; the other not to run*
> *Within the danger of the gods: the act being simply ill,*)
> Still entertaining thoughts divine, subdued the earthly still."

The words in the parentheses, it will be noticed, are Chapman's own, but they serve admirably to bring out into bolder relief the two phases of Bellerophon's conduct, which might otherwise be confounded. For the amplification in the succeeding lines there is less justification. Homer simply says:

> Ἡ δὲ ψευσαμένη Προῖτον βασιλῆα προσηύδα·
> τεθναίης, ὦ Προῖτ', ἢ κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην,
> ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότητι μιγήμεναι, οὐκ ἐθελούσῃ.

> "With lying words she then addressed the King:
> 'Die, Prœtus, thou, or slay Bellerophon,
> Who basely sought my honor to assail.'"
>
> —DERBY.

Here Chapman resorts to an antithesis which Homer might well have used:

> She, ruled by neither of his wits,[*] preferred her lust to both;
> And—false to Prœtus—would seem true; with this abhorred untroth:
> 'Prœtus, or die thyself,' said she, 'or let Bellerophon die.'"

We have, however, in this very connection, a striking instance of the beauty and exactness of Chapman's rendering.

The calumniated hero is dismissed by Prœtus, who is reluctant to take his life, but sends him to Lycia, the bearer of a tablet which is to insure his destruction upon his reaching his destination, the court of the Lycian king. Thither the traveler goes unharmed, for he goes,

> θεῶν ὑπ' ἀμύμονι πομπῇ,

that is, "under the faultless, or perfect, escort of the gods;" the idea of πομπή, as we see clearly from Odyssey v, 32, being "a sending under an escort, or in company." Ulysses, when he started from Calypso's isle, though sent by command of Jupiter and the rest of the gods, was to go, nevertheless,

> οὔτε θεῶν πομπῇ, οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,

---

[*] That is, neither wisdom nor prudence.

because neither gods nor men accompanied him. Now none of the translators whom we have met with expresses this delicate shade of thought:

> "To Lycia, guarded by the gods, he went," (says Derby;)
> "Under the favoring guidance of the gods," (is Bryant's version;)

but Chapman brings out the exact thought of the Homeric words in the beautiful line—

> "He went, and happily he went: *the gods walked all his way.*"

If we except Chapman, the oldest translator of Homer into English verse seems to have been John Ogilby, who styles himself upon the title-page of his folio, printed in 1669, under Charles II., "Master of His Majesties Revells in the Kingdom of Ireland." From so loyal a servant of the crown, it might naturally be expected that "Homer his Iliads" would have somewhat of a political tone where the case admitted of such an interpretation. Accordingly, the fulsome dedication to the King is rather a panegyric of the restored prince than of the Smyrnean bard himself, and the writer finds in the views of Homer respecting the kingly prerogative a better claim upon the attention of his Majesty than even the poet's transcendent literary merits. "And that which may render him yet more proper for Royal Entertainment," he remarks, "is, that he appears a most constant Assertor of the Divine Right of Princes and Monarchical Government. Be pleased to hear himself:

> "No good did many rulers ever bring;
> Let one be Lord; in Jove's name one be King.

"On the other side, all Anti-monarchical Persons he describes in the character of Thersites:

> "Who fondly vented incoherent Things
> 'Gainst Sovereign Power and Majesty of Kings:
> The most deformed Piece of all who came
> To th' Ilian siege; squint-eyed, crook-back'd, and lame;
> His breast bunch'd out; round was his head; a thin
> And callow down vested his meager chin.

"From what Prince, then, more justly may Homer hope for Patronage than from your Sacred Self, in whose Veins (besides your irrefragable Title to these three Kingdoms) the Channels of all the Royall Blood of Christendom concenters."

because neither gods nor men accompanied him. Now none of the translators whom we have met with expresses this delicate shade of thought:

"To Lycia, guarded by the gods, he went," (Lord Derby;)
"Under the favoring guidance of the gods," (in Bryant's version;)

but Chapman brings out the exact thought of the Homeric words in the beautiful line—

"He went, and happily he went: the gods walked all his way."

If we except Chapman, the oldest translator of Homer into English verse seems to have been John Ogilby, who styles himself upon the title-page of his folio, printed in 1669, under Charles II., "Master of His Majesties Revells in the Kingdom of Ireland." From so loyal a servant of the crown, it might naturally be expected that "Homer his Iliads" would have somewhat of a political tone where the text admitted of such an interpretation. Accordingly, the fulsome dedication to the King is rather a panegyric of the restored prince than of the Smyrnean bard himself, and the writer finds in the views of Homer respecting the kingly prerogative a better claim upon the attention of his Majesty than even the poet's transcendent literary merits. "And that which may render him yet more proper for Royal Entertainment," he remarks, "is, that he appears a most constant Assertor of the Divine Right of Princes and Monarchical Government. He pleased to hear himself:

"No good did many rulers ever bring,
Let one be Lord; in Jove's name one be King.

"On the other side, all Anti-monarchical Persons he describes in the character of Thersites:

"Who loudly vented scandalous Things
'Gainst Soveraign Power and Majesty of Kings:
The most deformed Piece of all who came
To th' Ilian siege; squint-eyed, worse-look'd, and lame;
His hunch back'd neck; round was his head; a thin
And yellow down round his meagre skin.

"From what Prince, then, more justly may Homer hope for Patronage than from your Sacred Self, in whose Veins (besides your irrefragable Title to these three Kingdoms) the Channels of all the Royall Blood of Christendom concenters."

Even casual allusions in the text serve to bring out the exuberant loyalty of the translator; as the address, "*Jove-loved Æacides*," is a sufficient excuse for the scholium: "Kings are God's peculiars, being more especially under his tuition and within his protection: a truth attested, not only by Christians, with whom Sovereign Princes, as being mixt Persons, are likewise sacred, but subscribed also by the Heathens themselves."

Unfortunately, Ogilby's loyalty does not make his verses any the better. Pope declared that they were too mean for criticism, and this was not pure detraction. Open where you will, and the statement is fully borne out. For example, how feeble and unlike Homer is Ogilby's rendering of the final refusal of Achilles to return to the Greek camp in answer to the solicitations of the envoys, Iliad, Book IX:

"Ajax, thou noble race of Telamon,
Thou speak'st thy thoughts, and no dissembler art;
But swelling passion breaks my wounded heart
When I but think how me Atrides used,
And like some base barbarian abused.
Be pleased to tell him, I shall take no care
To stop the deluge of devouring war,
Before great Hector, Priam's warlike son,
By slaughter of the Grecians prompted on,
Shall on your quarters resolutely set,
Burning with Phrygian flames the Grecian fleet.
But when to my pavilion he draws near,
'*Tis likely he shall find resistance there.*"

It need scarcely be said that antiquated terms occur, as in Book IV:

"The Father both of Men and Gods obeyed,
And thus to his illustrious Daughter said,
'Go, make the Trojans first their Oath *renegue*,[*]
And by some treacherous Art infringe the League.'"

Here it may be noticed that we have also a good illustration of Ogilby's lack of fidelity to the original, since the first line of Jupiter's injunction to Minerva he altogether omits:

Αἶψα μαλ' ἐς στρατὸν ἐλθὲ μετὰ Τρῶας *καὶ* 'Αχαιούς.

Nor is there any compensation for this wanton sacrifice of exactness in the elegance of the poet's diction. The very first

[*] That is, French *renier*, deny.

line of the work is a singular instance of the alliteration which is most displeasing to the ear—rapid succession of sibilants:

> "Achilles,' Peleus' Son's, destructive rage,
> Great Goddess, sing."

The next translation of Homer into English verse stands in some respects by itself. It is the work of one professedly not a devotee of the muses but a philosopher, and is consequently not an ambitious attempt to emulate the fame of predecessors or rivals, but the delightful entertainment of the enforced leisure of old age. When he had passed, by several years, the fourscore that constitute to most men the extreme limit of life, Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, wearied with the incessant and virulent disputes in which his theories both in mathematics and in philosophy had for a long time kept him involved, laid down the pen of the controversialist, and applied himself to studies more in keeping with the quiet for which age thirsts. At the close of his address "To the Reader, concerning the virtues of an heroic poem," after magnifying the excellence of Homer in comparison with Virgil, he proceeds to say, respecting the version he for the first time offers to the public: "But howsoever I defend Homer, I aim not thereby at any reflection upon the following translation. Why, then, did I write it? *Because I had nothing else to do.* Why publish it? Because I thought it might take off my adversaries from showing their folly upon my more serious writings, and set them upon my verses to show their wisdom."

That the work undertaken as a simple diversion at an advanced age, and by an author who had consecrated the prime of life to widely different pursuits, should bear marks of carelessness in places, and glow with little poetic fervor, is only what we might have expected. But Pope goes much too far when he associates Hobbes with Ogilby, and declares their poetry to be "too mean for criticism;" and his editor, Sir William Molesworth, sensibly observes, that "some may possibly find the unstudied and unpretending language of Hobbes conveys an idea less remote from the original than the smooth and glittering lines of Pope and his coadjutors."

Let us, for the purpose of testing the accuracy of this remark, compare a passage taken almost at random from both authors;

for instance, the beautiful lines of Homer in his Odyssey, (Book VI, 101–109,) describing the queenly appearance of Nausicaa, when, after their labors, she and her attendant maidens diverted themselves with a game of ball near the thicket where lay the shipwrecked Ulysses:

Τῇσι δὲ Ναυσικάα λευκώλενος ἤρχετο μολπῆς
Οἵη δ' Ἄρτεμις εἶσι κ. τ. λ.

In Hobbes it thus appears:

"The tune Nausicaa sung for them all.
As when upon Mount Erymanthus high
Or on Taÿgetus stands Artemis,
And many rural fair nymphs playing by.
But she than all the rest much taller is,
And the wild boars and harts delight to see,
But more her mother Leda to see her,
For though they fair were all, yet fairer she;
So shew'd Nausicaa and her maidens there."—100–108.

The first thing to be noticed here is, that the translator has succeeded in drawing the picture which Homer first drew, in exactly the same number of lines, as indeed his translation corresponds throughout almost line for line with the Greek poem. And a second point equally worthy of notice is, that Pope's remark is fully borne out here, "that Hobbes has given us a correct explanation of the sense in general, but for particulars and circumstances he continually lops them, and often omits the most beautiful;" adding, "as for its being esteemed a close translation, I doubt not many have been led into that error by the shortness of it, which proceeds not from his following the original line by line, but from the contractions above mentioned. He sometimes omits whole similes and sentences." Thus, in the passage before us the epithet *high* (*περιμήκετος*) is transferred from Taÿgetus, the loftiest range in Peloponnesus, to Erymanthus, to which it is less appropriate.* Artemis loses her epithet *ιοχέαιρα*—the *delighter in the arrow*, the *arrow-queen*. Leda is a slip of the pen, probably for Latona or *Leto*, the Greek form of the deity's name. More objectionable, however, than any of these minor inadvertences

---

* The highest peak of the former seems to be 7,903 feet, (7,415 French feet,) of the latter 7,295 feet (6,845 French feet) in height. H. Kiepert, *das Kœnigreich Griechenland.*

is the confusion which the poet has made by an unauthorized transposition, quite obscuring thereby the fact that the point of the comparison of Nausicaa to Artemis was, that the one was as distinguishable by her noble size and resplendent beauty from her attendant maidens as was the other from the woodland nymphs. But while thus pointing out the defects of Hobbes, ought we not to examine the performance of the bard of Twickenham, who with such assurance claims, in the preface to his Iliad, to have given "a more tolerable translation of Homer than any entire copy in verse has yet done," and who would doubtless arrogate as much for his Odyssey as for his Iliad:

> "Nausicaa lifts her voice,
> And, warbling sweet, makes earth and heaven rejoice.
> As when o'er Erymanth Diana roves,
> Or wide Taÿgetus's resounding groves;
> A sylvan train the huntress queen surrounds,
> Her rattling quiver from her shoulder sounds;
> Fierce in the sport, along the mountain's brow
> They bay the boar, or chase the bounding roe;
> High o'er the lawn, with more majestic pace,
> Above the nymphs she treads with stately grace;
> Distinguished excellence the goddess proves;
> Exults Latona as the virgin moves.
> With equal grace Nausicaa trod the plain,
> And shone transcendent o'er the beauteous train."—117–128.

Notice here the utter disregard of accurate translation. Nausicaa is no longer the "white-armed"—λευκώλενος—but by way of compensation she "warbles sweet," and "makes earth and heaven rejoice." All that is characteristic in the haunts of Diana vanishes as well, and we have the gratuitous insertion of the "resounding groves" of "wide" Taÿgetus. The nymphs, daughters of ægis-bearing Jove, become "a sylvan train;" while, in the picture of Diana, the circumstance that she was head and shoulders above her attending nymphs is omitted, and we fail to catch the very point of the comparison.

The description, by Ulysses, of the effect of his present of wine to Polyphemus, (Odyssey ix, 373–392,) may serve as an example of Hobbes's versification:

> "When I had said, the good wine he drank up,
> And was extremely pleaséd with the same;
> And straightway calling for another cup,
> 'Tell me,' quoth he, 'right now, what is thy name,

is the conclusion which the poet has made by an unauthorized transposition, quite obscuring thereby the fact that the point of the comparison of Nausicaa to Artemis was, that the one was as distinguishable by her noble size and resplendent beauty from her attendant maidens as was the other from the woodland nymphs. But while thus pointing out the defects of Hobbes, ought we not to examine the performance of the bard of Twickenham, who with such assurance claims, in the preface to his Iliad, to have given "a more tolerable translation of Homer than any entire copy in verse has yet done," and who would doubtless arrogate as much for his Odyssey as for his Iliad:

"Nausicaa lifts her voice,
And, warbling sweet, makes earth and heaven rejoice.
As when o'er Erymanth Diana roves,
Or wide Taygetus' resounding groves;
A sylvan train the huntress queen surrounds,
Her rattling quiver from her shoulder sounds;
Fierce in the sport, along the mountain's brow
They bay the boar, or chase the bounding roe;
High o'er the lawn, with more majestic pace,
Above the nymphs she treads with stately grace;
Distinguished excellence the goddess proves;
Exults Latona as the virgin moves.
With equal grace Nausicaa trod the plain,
And shone transcendent o'er the beauteous train."—117–128.

Notice here the utter disregard of accurate translation. Nausicaa is no longer the "white-armed"—λευκώλενος—but by way of compensation she "warbles sweet," and "makes earth and heaven rejoice." All that is characteristic in the beauty of Diana vanishes as well, and we have the gratuitous insertion of the "resounding groves" of "wide" Taygetus. The nymphs, daughters of aegis-bearing Jove, become "a sylvan train;" while, in the picture of Diana, the circumstance that she was head and shoulders above her attending nymphs is omitted, and we fail to catch the very point of the comparison.

The description, by Ulysses, of the effect of his present of wine to Polyphemus, (Odyssey ix, 378–382,) may serve as an example of Hobbes's versification:

"When I had said, the good wine he drank up,
And was extremely pleased with the same;
And somewhat merry calling for another cup,
'Tell me,' quoth he, 'right now, what is thy name

And I will give thee what shall please thy heart.
We Cyclopses have vines that yield good wine,
Which from the earth by rain from heaven start;
But this same branch of nectar is divine.'
When he had said, I gave him wine again;
Three times I filled the can, and he as oft
Drank 't off. But when it came up to his brain,
Then spake I to him gentle words and soft:
'Cyclops, since you my name desire to know,
I'll tell it you, and on your word rely.
My name is *Noman*, all men call me so,
My father, mother, and my company.'
To which he soon and sadly made reply,
'Noman, I'll eat you last, none shall outlive you
Of all that are here of your company;
And that's the gift I promised to give you.'"

It cannot be denied that here is considerable vigor of expression, but it is accompanied by a rough and unpoetical diction; while, if we compare the passage with Homer's narrative, we find it characterized by baldness—epithets the most apt being not infrequently eliminated to reduce the matter to a bulk equal to the original—in short, all the marks of an unimaginative nature to which the higher realm of the muses was an uncongenial abode.

The same remarks apply to the crafty Ithacan's account of the ineffectual call of the blinded giant upon his brother Cyclopes for assistance, (Odyssey ix, 420–436,) as reproduced by Hobbes:

"And so awhile he there amazed stands,
And thence for more Cyclopses calls; and they
Who dwelt about in every hollow cave,
Came in, some one and some another way;
And from without the den asked what he'd have.
'What ails thee, Polyphemus, so to cry
In dead of night, and make us break our sleep?
Goes any one about to make thee die,
By force or fraud, or steal away thy sheep?'
Then Polyphemus answered from his cave,
'Friends, *Noman* kills me!' 'Why, then,' said they,
'We have no power from sickness you to save;
You must unto your father Neptune pray.'
This said, they parted each one to his own
Dark cavern; then within myself I laughed
To think how with my name the mighty clown
I so deceived had, and gulled by craft."

The most famous translation ever yet made in the English tongue, to which we have already had frequent occasion to refer, is certainly that written by Alexander Pope. Few productions of genius have exercised a more lasting influence, whether for better or for worse, upon public taste, or more divided the suffrages of the literary. Dr. Samuel Johnson declared that Pope's Iliad "is certainly the noblest version of poetry which the world has ever seen, and its publication must therefore be considered as one of the great events in the annals of learning." But over against this almost extravagant laudation we must set the no less remarkable disparagement of Pope by the celebrated Joseph Addison, who was wont to rate above it the translation of the first book of the Iliad, published about the same time by Thomas Tickell, a poet now well-nigh forgotten, and to declare that the latter was the best version ever written. That neither of these opinions is just, will probably be the conclusion of almost every impartial reader. It is too late to attempt to reverse the judgment of the world in the matter of Alexander Pope's original compositions. Whatever may be our estimate of his imaginative powers—whether or not we view his imagery as rather a laborious compilation from various sources than the legitimate offspring of his own mind—it is undeniable that few writers have equaled him in felicity and appropriateness of expression. But the very qualities which give zest to his own poems debarred his becoming a successful translator of Homer. The studied antithesis, the piquant epigram, the "*tour de force*" which surprise and startle the spectator—these must find their way even into the majestic epic whose very idea implies calm and repose. And this for a very good reason. The habit of calculating the effect of every thing he said and did was either a part of Pope's nature, or had been so long practiced as to become a second nature to him. His study was, indeed, to appear natural; but real nature was as abhorrent to his ideas of refinement, and as commonplace, as the duties of the farm-house and the dairy would have been to the exquisites and fine ladies who indulged in raptures over the Arcadia which Queen Marie Antoinette had created for herself in the seclusion of the Petit Trianon. This was so patent that it could not be overlooked even by a biographer so partial as Dr. Johnson. "In all his intercourse

with mankind he had great delight in artifice, and endeavored to attain all his purposes by indirect and unsuspected methods. 'He hardly drank tea without a stratagem.' If, at the house of friends, he wanted any accommodation, he was not willing to ask for it in plain terms, but would mention it remotely as something convenient; though, when it was procured, he soon made it appear for whose sake it had been recommended. He practiced his arts on such small occasions that Lady Bolingbroke used to say, in a French phrase, that 'he played the politician about cabbages and turnips.'"

In fact, there was so much that was petty and mean about Pope that we can scarcely be surprised at his failure to rise to the sublime simplicity of Homer. He thought less of his literary distinction than of the little fortune, as he termed it, which he had laid up. "It would be hard," remarks Dr. Johnson, "to find a man, so well entitled to notice by his wit, that ever delighted so much in talking of his money. In his letters and in his poems, his garden and his grotto, his quincunx and his vines, or some hints of his opulence, are always to be found. The great topic of his ridicule is poverty; the crimes with which he reproaches his antagonists are their debts, their habitation in the Mint, and their want of a dinner. He seems to be of an opinion, not very uncommon in the world, that to want money is to want every thing."

It is, however, the capital error into which Pope fell respecting the true function of a translator that chiefly vitiates his work. To give a passably correct paraphrase of his author's sense was all that he aimed at, or that the public demanded of him. The fault was after all, therefore, no less that of the age than his own. Being granted so much latitude, it is not wonderful that the translator took advantage of it. He was not a profound scholar in any department, least of all in the literature of Greece; and even the simple idiom which Homer employs presented to him frequent difficulties. There were, however, many helps—previous translations in verse and in prose, and commentaries—which he consulted through the medium of friends more familiar with the languages in which they were written than he was. He could have recourse to such friends for advice on points of special difficulty, and when fatigued with composition, he could even salary their pens. It is well known that

in the translation of the Odyssey this was particularly the case. After the great pecuniary success of his "Iliad," there was a large reward sure to follow the completion of his second work, to attain which with greater expedition and with less toil he called in the assistance of Fenton and Broome. Only twelve books were written by Pope; the remainder, or one half of the entire work, was the production of his coadjutors, with such assistance, in the way of correction, as he was pleased to accord them.

By the means he had within reach, having gained a general conception of the Greek poet's meaning, the translator seems to have set himself at work, little caring to preserve any exact correspondence between his version and the original. The main point was to attain a flowing verse and a perfect rhyme. To secure these, much must be omitted, more modified, and not a little arbitrarily introduced. Not that Pope can be accused of such extensive interpolations as those which he censures in Chapman, for they rarely exceed the limits of a line, or amount to more than the unwarranted insertion of an epithet. But, on the other hand, they are destitute of the justification, or, at least, palliation of which those of Chapman are susceptible. They introduce not what is congenial to Homer, but what is alien to his spirit. They are no "companion pieces to those which Homer had already painted," as Mr. Taylor very felicitously styles many of Chapman's unauthorized additions. They are rather foreign coloring superimposed, and that with too little discrimination, so that it disturbs the harmony of the parts, distracts the attention, and weakens the effect. Or, to change the figure, Homer is, for the most part, a clear, pellucid stream, which flows on so steadily and noiselessly as to attract little notice, while revealing with distinctness every rock and pebble in its bed. Pope would not be himself unless he were perpetually making an exertion to attract admiration. We are continually forgetting what he says in our enforced watchfulness to see in how sprightly a manner he says it.

A good instance, as well of the excellences as of the inaccuracies of Pope as a translator, is afforded by that passage in the fifth book of the Iliad in which the Greek poet likens the dust rising from the charge of the Greeks upon the Trojans to the chaff whitening the floor when men winnow the ripened grain:

In the translation of the Odyssey this was particularly the case. After the great pecuniary success of his "Iliad," there was a large reward sure to follow the completion of his second work, to attain which with greater expedition and with less toil he called in the assistance of Fenton and Broome. Only twelve books were written by Pope; the remainder, or one-half of the entire work, was the production of his coadjutors, with such assistance, in the way of correction, as he was pleased to accord them.

By the means he had within reach, having gained a general conception of the Greek poet's meaning, the translator seems to have set himself at work, little caring to preserve any exact correspondence between his version and the original. The main point was to attain a flowing verse, and a perfect rhyme. To secure these, much must be omitted, some modified, and not a little arbitrarily introduced. Not that Pope can be accused of such extensive interpolations as those which he censures in Chapman, for they rarely exceed the limits of a line, or amount to more than the unwarranted insertion of an epithet. But, on the other hand, they are destitute of the justification, or, at least, palliation of which those of Chapman are susceptible. They introduce not what is congenial to Homer, but what is alien to his spirit. They are no "companion pieces to those which Homer had already painted," as Mr. Taylor very felicitously styles many of Chapman's unauthorized additions. They are rather foreign coloring superimposed, and that with too little discrimination, so that it disturbs the harmony of the parts, distracts the attention, and weakens the effect. Or, to change the figure, Homer is, for the most part, a clear, pellucid stream, which flows on so steadily and noiselessly as to attract little notice, while revealing with distinctness every rock and pebble in its bed. Pope would not be himself unless he were perpetually making an exertion to attract admiration. We are continually forgetting what he says in our enforced watchfulness to see in how sprightly a manner he says it.

A good instance, as well of the excellences as of the infidelities of Pope as a translator, is afforded by that passage in the fifth book of the Iliad in which the Greek poet likens the dust rising from the charge of the Greeks upon the Trojans to the chaff whitening the floor when men winnow the ripened grain:

'Ως δ' ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέει ἱερὰς κατ' ἀλωάς,
'Ανδρῶν λικμώντων, ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ
Κρίνῃ, ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων, καρπόν τε καὶ ἄχνας, etc.

The passage is thus rendered by Pope:

"They turn, they stand, the Greeks their fury dare,
Condense their powers, and wait the growing war.
As when, on Ceres' sacred floor, the swain
Spreads the wide fan to clear the golden grain,
And the light chaff, before the breezes borne,
Ascends in clouds from off the heapy corn," etc.

See what a different picture we have here drawn for us from that which the original presents. Whereas Homer makes Ceres the agent, because the whole process of separating the wheat from the chaff was performed upon the floor consecrated to that goddess and under her protection, with Pope it is "the swain" who is brought out prominently to view. But, not content with destroying this highly poetical conception, he also describes the operation in a way that shows that he has forgotten, if he ever knew, the peculiar agriculture practiced among the Greeks from Homer's time down to the present. There was no "spreading the wide fan to clear the golden grain" at all about it. The implement used was nothing that could be spread, nor was it a *fan*, properly speaking. It was a broad shovel with which the farmer threw up the grain against the fresh wind, and the wind blew away the light and chaffy particles with which the grain was mingled. On the large paved threshing-floors at the foot of the remaining columns of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, just outside of the city of Athens, we have often seen the Greek peasants repeating the winnowing in the identical manner in which they performed it in the ninth century before Christ.

Homer has, indeed, so graphically described the self-same operation in another place, that it would seem impossible for a careful reader to mistake his meaning. Describing (Book XIII, 518, etc.) the manner in which the arrow of Helenus glanced off from the armor of Menelaus, the poet likens it to the impulse with which beans or pulse fly from the broad shovel of the winnower:

'Ως δ' ὅτ' ἀπὸ πλατέος πτυόφιν μεγάλην κατ' ἀλωὴν
Θρώσκουσιν κύαμοι μελανόχροες, ἢ ἐρέβινθοι,
Πνοιῇ ὕπὸ λιγυρῇ καὶ λικμητῆρος ἐρωῇ.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

The passage is thus rendered by Pope:

"They turn, they stand; the Greeks their fury dare,
Condense their powers, and wait the growing war.
As when, on Ceres' sacred floor, the swain
Spreads the wide fan, to clear the golden grain,
And the light chaff, before the breezes borne,
Ascends in clouds from off the heapy corn," etc.

See what a different picture we here have drawn for us from that which the original presents. Whereas Homer makes Ceres the agent, because the whole process of separating the wheat from the chaff was performed upon the floor consecrated to that goddess and under her protection, with Pope it is "the swain" who is brought out prominently to view. But, not content with destroying this highly poetical conception, he also describes the operation in a way that shows that he has forgotten, if he ever knew, the peculiar agriculture practised among the Greeks from Homer's time down to the present. There was no "spreading the wide fan to clear the golden grain" at all about it. The implement used was nothing that could be spread, nor was it a *fan*, properly speaking. It was a broad shovel with which the farmer threw up the grain against the fresh wind, and the wind blew away the light and chaffy particles with which the grain was mingled. On the large paved threshing-floor at the foot of the remaining columns of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, just outside of the city of Athens, we have often seen the Greek peasantry repeating the winnowing in the identical manner in which they performed it in the ninth century before Christ.

Homer has, indeed, so graphically described the selfsame operation in another place, that it would seem impossible for a careful reader to mistake his meaning. Describing (Book XIII. 588, etc.) the manner in which the arrows of Helenus glanced off from the armor of Menelaus, the poet likens it to the impulse with which beans or pulse fly from the broad shovel of the winnower:

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

But here Pope again reveals his ignorance or his carelessness, for he translates, or re-writes, the passage thus:

"As on some ample barn's well-hardened floor,
(The winds collected at each open door,)
While the broad fan with force is whirled around,
Light leaps the golden grain, resulting* from the ground."

Only we have here additional inventions of the translator. The scene is not the antique threshing-floor in the open air, but shifts to the modern barn.† The wind is indeed admitted through the doors, but has no function to perform. It is the "broad fan," "with force whirled around," that does the execution; and not from it, but from the ground, the golden grain—not the beans and pulse—"light leaps."

We pass to one of the most engaging and one of the sweetest poets with whom England has ever been favored—a poet no less estimable as a man than respectable as an artist—William Cowper. He had already manifested his rare abilities as an original writer, and become famous as the author of "John Gilpin" and of "The Task," when, relapsing into the constitutional melancholy which was the great bane of his life, he felt the absolute necessity of finding some employment less severe and exacting than the composition of fresh verses of his own, yet sufficiently engrossing to withdraw his thoughts from his own infirmities, and to turn him away from the verge of that insanity with whose proximity he was ever haunted. This employment he found in the translation of Homer. Not that he at once entered seriously upon so appalling an undertaking as was that of putting into English verse some forty thousand lines of Greek poetry. But having commenced, almost without thinking of what he was doing, by versifying a score or so of Homer's lines as a pastime, and having extracted considerable diversion from the attempt, he was led to repeat the process, and, his interest rather increasing than diminishing, he found himself allured on further and further, until the task whose magnitude might have affrighted him had he contemplated it at the beginning, seemed far from wearisome or impracticable. It was not, however, until he had gotten much

---

* That is, leaping back.

† Munford makes the same mistake:

"And *barns* are whitened with the rising cloud."

But here Pope again reveals his ignorance or his carelessness, for he translates, or re-writes, the passage thus;

"As on some ample barn's well-harden'd floor,
(The winds collected at each open door,)
While the broad fan with force is whirl'd around,
Light leaps the golden grain, resulting * from the ground:"

Only we have here additional inventions of the translator. The scene is not the antique threshing-floor in the open air, but shifts to the modern barn.† The wind is indeed admitted through the doors, but has no function to perform. It is the "broad fan," "with force whirled around," that does the execution; and not from it, but from the ground, the golden grain—not the beans and pulse—"light leaps."

We pass to one of the most engaging and one of the sweetest poets with whom England has ever been favored—a poet no less estimable as a man than respectable as an artist—William Cowper. He had already manifested his rare abilities as an original writer, and become famous as the author of "John Gilpin" and of "The Task," when, relapsing into the constitutional melancholy which was the great bane of his life, he felt the absolute necessity of finding some employment less severe and exacting than the composition of fresh verses of his own, yet sufficiently engrossing to withdraw his thoughts from his own infirmities, and to turn him away from the verge of that insanity with whose proximity he was ever haunted. This employment he found in the translation of Homer. Not that he at once entered seriously upon so appalling an undertaking as was that of putting into English verse some forty thousand lines of Greek poetry. But having commenced, almost without thinking of what he was doing, by versifying a score or so of Homer's lines as a pastime, and having extracted considerable diversion from the attempt, he was led to repeat the process, and, his interest rather increasing than diminishing, he found himself allured on further and further, until the task whose magnitude might have affrighted him had he contemplated it at the beginning, seemed far from wearisome or impracticable. It was not, however, until he had gotten much

---

* That is, leaping back.

† Munford makes the same mistake:

"And husks are winnowed with the rising cloud."

beyond the middle of the Iliad that he ventured to acquaint his friends with what he intended to do, for he feared, with good reason, that it might otherwise appear problematic whether he would complete his work. Some of his friends, indeed, were not a little disappointed that one who had recently developed such extraordinary powers as an independent wooer of the Muses should stoop to the apparently lower level of a translator of the writings of another. And so Cowper's letters, written in his inimitable playfulness, are rather of an apologetic tone about this time, as if deprecating the censure which he felt he half deserved. Thus to the Rev. John Newton he wrote, December 3, 1785: "Homer, in point of purity, is a most blameless writer; and, though he was not an enlightened man, has interspersed many great and valuable truths throughout both his poems. In short, he is in all respects a most venerable old gentleman, by an acquaintance with whom no man can disgrace himself. The *literati* are all agreed to a man that, although Pope has given us two pretty poems under Homer's titles, there is not to be found in them the least portion of Homer's spirit, nor the least resemblance to his manner. I will try, therefore, whether I cannot copy him somewhat more happily myself. I have, at least, the advantage of Pope's faults and failings, which, like so many buoys upon a dangerous coast, will serve me to steer by, and will make my chance more probable. These and many other considerations, but especially a mind that abhorred a vacuum as its chief bane, induced me so effectually to the work, that ere long I mean to publish proposals for a subscription to it."

Cowper had in his unusually close acquaintance with Homer, and Homer's modes of thought and of expression, a fine preparation for his work. Years before he had read and re-read his immortal works in company with a friend equally devoted to classical pursuits. They had studied him by himself, they had compared with him and with each other the older English versions, and Pope's, which was still all the rage, had particularly disgusted them. "I never saw," he wrote at a later date,* "a copy so unlike the original. There is not, I believe, in all the world to be found an uninspired poem so simple as those of Homer; nor in all the world a poem more bedizened with beyond the middle of the Iliad that he ventured to acquaint his friends with what he intended to do, for he feared, with good reason, that it might otherwise appear problematic whether he would complete his work. Some of his friends, indeed, were not a little disappointed that one who had recently developed such extraordinary powers as an independent wooer of the Muses should stoop to the apparently lower level of a translator of the writings of another. And so Cowper's letters, written in his inimitable playfulness, are rather of an apologetic tone about this time, as if deprecating the censure which he felt he half deserved. Thus to the Rev. John Newton he wrote, December 3, 1785: "Homer, in point of purity, is a most blameless writer; and, though he was not an enlightened man, has interspersed many great and valuable truths throughout both his poems. In short, he is all, so speaks a most venerable old gentleman, by an acquaintance with whom no man can disgrace himself. The literati are all agreed to a man that, although Pope has given us two pretty poems under Homer's titles, there is not to be found in them the least portion of Homer's spirit, nor the least resemblance to his manner. I will try, therefore, whether I cannot copy him somewhat more happily myself. I have, at least, the advantage of Pope's faults and failings, which, like so many buoys upon a dangerous coast, will serve me to steer by, and will make my chance more probable. These and many other considerations, but especially a mind that abhorred a vacuum as its chief bane, induced me so effectually to the work, that ere long I mean to publish proposals for a subscription to it."

---

* Letter to Rev. John Newton, December 10, 1785.

Cowper had in his unusually close acquaintance with Homer, and Homer's modes of thought and of expression, a fine preparation for his work. Years before he had read and re-read his immortal works in company with a friend equally devoted to classical pursuits. They had studied him by himself, they had compared with him and with each other the older English versions, and Pope's, which was still all the rage, had particularly disgusted them. "I never saw," he wrote at a later date,* "a copy so unlike the original. There is not, I believe, in all the world to be found an uninspired poem so simple as those of Homer; nor in all the world a poem more bedizened with ornament than Pope's translation of them. Accordingly, the sublime of Homer in the hands of Pope becomes bloated and tumid, and his description tawdry. Neither had Pope the faintest conception of those exquisite discriminations of character for which Homer is so remarkable. All his persons, and equally upon all occasions, speak in an inflated and strutting phraseology as Pope managed them; although in the original, the dignity of their utterance, even where they are most majestic, consists principally in the simplicity of their language. Another censure I must needs pass upon our Anglo-Grecian, out of many that obtrude themselves upon me, but for which I have neither time to spare nor room, which is, that with all his great abilities he was defective in his feelings to a degree that some passages in his own poems make it difficult to account for. No writer more pathetic than Homer, because none more natural; and because none less natural than Pope in his version of Homer, therefore than he none less pathetic."

---

* Letter to Rev. John Newton, December 10, 1785.

The utter failure of his great predecessor (avowedly a great poet when he undertook to give expression to his own thoughts) in the attempt to reproduce Homer's writings in English verse, Cowper ascribed in great part to the fact that Pope had trammeled himself with rhyme. He regarded it an utter impossibility for a poet, no matter how skillful he might be in the use of language, to give the sense of a foreign work with strict fidelity if he burdened himself with the requirement that his lines should be rhyming couplets. In blank verse the problem might be solved, in rhymed verses never. Not that it is easier under ordinary circumstances to compose blank verse than to rhyme; on the contrary, while almost every body can write tolerable verses, such is the fatal facility of the English language but few can form respectable blank verse, so great is the care and variety which the successful prosecution of this species demands. But it is impracticable to find a form of words with similar terminations that shall adequately express the sense of any given passage in a poem written in a foreign language.

With these views Cowper undertook to translate the Iliad and the Odyssey, the former of which he published in 1791. If his performance did not completely realize his high expectations, it was not from any defect in his general plan. He

was undoubtedly correct in his choice of a metre, and he had the right view of the translator's province as limited to the close reproduction of his original. But he was less fortunate in the execution, despite the assurances with which his letters abound, that he would allow no defective line to escape his attention and correction. No one can deny that his versification is often rough, the flow of words irregular and interrupted, the constructions involved and harsh; in fine, very unlike the calm, majestic movement that every-where characterizes Homer's own hexameters. Take, for instance, so favorable an example of his style as that contained in the twelfth book of the Iliad, where Hector indignantly rebukes Polydamas for giving heed to the unfavorable augury derived from the circumstance that a bird in its flight had dropped a serpent between the contending armies:

> "To whom, dark-lowering, Hector thus replied:
> 'Polydamas! I like not thy advice;
> Thou couldst have framed far better; but if this
> Be thy deliberate judgment, then the gods
> Make thy deliberate judgment nothing worth,
> Who bidd'st me disregard the Thunderer's firm
> Assurance to myself announced, and make
> The wild inhabitants of air my guides,
> Which I alike despise, speed they their course
> With right-hand flight toward the ruddy East,
> Or leftward down into the shades of eve.
> Consider *we* the will of Jove alone,
> Sovereign of heaven and earth. Omens abound,
> But the best omen is our country's cause.[*]
> Wherefore should fiery war *thy* soul alarm?
> For were we slaughtered, one and all, around
> The fleet of Greece, *thou* need'st not fear to die,
> Whose courage never will thy flight retard.

---

[*] The various translations of the famous line (243) in the Greek,

Εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος, ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης,

are themselves a study:—

Voss: Ein Wahrzeichen nur gilt: das Vaterland zu erretten.
Ogilby: 'Tis a good sign, we for our country fight.
Derby: (following Cowper almost word for word,)
The best of omens is our country's cause.
Sotheby: Watch thou the flight of birds—such omens, thine:
One—far o'er all—to guard my country—mine.
Munford: One omen is the best, and that is ours,
That we are bravely fighting to defend
Our native country.

> But if thou shrink thyself, or by smooth speech
> Seduce one other from a soldier's part,
> Pierced by this spear, incontinent thou diest."—230, etc.

This is, perhaps, as favorable an example of the verses of Cowper as we could well give, yet it brings to light some of the poet's deficiencies—deficiencies which, to use the words of another, render his work "cold and repulsive." "The Homeric hexameters," writes a recent critic,* "have an independence wholly foreign to the more complicated hexameters of Virgil; and the sequence of ideas is kept so distinct, that one is commonly dismissed before the next is introduced; but harsh involutions give to Cowper's translation a stiff and stilted character. . . . It is one of the first duties of a translator to construct his sentences as closely after the manner of the original as the idiom of another language will permit, but the intricate syntax and inverted constructions of Cowper are not suggested by any thing in the style of Homer."

Cowper's Homer inaugurated a new series of translations. The view which he promulgated, and endeavored to put into practice in his own work, has come to be generally accepted as sound and judicious. It is now admitted almost upon all sides, that the paramount obligation resting upon the translator is accuracy; that care in the selection of corresponding idioms, in the adoption of equivalent epithets, in the similar distribution of the matter, is not labor thrown away. A few critics, it is true, continue to advocate the old theory and practice, according to which a very loose paraphrase is allowed to assume the name of a translation, however unfaithful it may be to the form, and even the spirit, of the original. Thus a recent writer in the "North American Review" (October, 1870) is in favor of nothing that lies between a simple rendering of the Greek into

---

Pope: (free as usual,)

> Without a sign, his sword the brave man draws,
> And asks no omen but his country's cause.

Bryant: . . . One augury

> There is, the surest and the best—to fight
> For our own land.

Barter: (probably the most literal,)

> One augury is best, to fight for native land.

Perhaps the most exact rendering which can be given in our language would be,

> One omen's best—to fight for fatherland.

* "Edinburgh Review," January, 1865.

English prose, and a poem free from the trammeling necessity of a close translation. "Of the two kinds of translation which we like," he remarks, "one is an exact rendering of the original text into idiomatic prose. The other kind can be made only by a poet who reproduces the thoughts and pictures of the original in his own style, and in a metre native to his own language. Hence we consider Pope's Iliad, with all its faults, more like Homer's than any other poetical translation, just as some living hero is, on the whole, more like Achilles than any statue. All other poetic translators, except Chapman, are between these extremes. They compromise difficulties of expression and difficulties of interpretation, trying to be either as literal as is consistent with versification, or as poetical as is consistent with literalness. Of these the best is Mr. Bryant. He has produced a better poem than any other of his school, and has adhered as closely to the text as any but the prose translators."

To the specious argument implied in the comparison instituted by this writer we might with propriety reply: The argument proves too much, if it proves any thing at all. It is true that in some particulars a living hero may be more like Achilles than any statue can be, and so likewise any two poems, however diverse in character—even if they possess not a single thought, not a single expression in common—may be said to be so far alike as that both are good. We might go to the living hero to discover to what class of men we ought to refer Achilles, to any good poem to learn what is excellence in poetical composition; but to declare Pope to resemble Homer because both were good poets, would be as absurd as to say that the personal appearance of General Sherman gave a good idea of the looks of Julius Cæsar or Napoleon Bonaparte.

This world, we say, is pretty well agreed, and has been ever since Cowper's time, respecting the paramount necessity that the version should be as exact as language and poetical diction will allow, and all the more recent attempts to give Homer an English dress have gone upon this assumption, with perhaps but a single exception. Philip Stanhope Worsley's Odyssey *

---

* The Odyssey of Homer, translated into English verse, in the Spenserian Stanza, by P. S. Worsley, M.A., Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. (London, 1861–2.)

English prose, and a poem free from the trammeling necessity of a close translation. "Of the two kinds of translation which we like," he remarks, "one is an exact rendering of the original text into idiomatic prose. The other kind can be made only by a poet who reproduces the thoughts and pictures of the original in his own style and in a metre native to his own language. Hence we consider Pope's Iliad, with all its faults, more like Homer's than any other metrical translation, just as some living hero is, on the whole, more like Achilles than any statue. All other poetic translators, except Chapman, are between these extremes. They compromise difficulties of expression and difficulties of interpretation, trying to be either as literal as is consistent with versification, or as poetical as is consistent with literalness. Of these the best is Mr. Bryant. He has produced a better poem than any other of his school, and has adhered as closely to the text as any but the prose translators."

To the specious argument implied in the comparison instituted by this writer we might with propriety reply: The argument proves too much, if it proves any thing at all. It is true that in some particulars a living hero may be more like Achilles than any statue can be, and so likewise any two poems, however diverse in character—even if they possess not a single thought, not a single expression in common—may be said to be so far alike as that both are good. We might go to the living hero to discover to what class of men we ought to refer Achilles, to any good poem to learn what is excellent in poetical composition; but to declare Pope to resemble Homer because both were good poets, would be as absurd as to say that the personal appearance of General Sherman gave a good idea of the looks of Julius Cæsar or Napoleon Bonaparte.

This world, we say, is pretty well agreed, and has been ever since Cowper's time, respecting the paramount necessity that the version should be as exact as language and poetical diction will allow, and all the more recent attempts to give Homer an English dress have gone upon this assumption, with perhaps but a single exception. Philip Stanhope Worsley's Odyssey *

---

* The Odyssey of Homer, translated into English verse, in the Spenserian stanza, by P. S. Worsley, M.A., Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. (Books 1861-2.)

is not only exceedingly free in its general renderings, but admits very considerable insertions and expansions, somewhat after the style of Chapman, and this to such an extent that a very favorable critic* is forced to observe: "It is needless, however, to dwell on a fault (if fault it be after all) which runs through the whole translation," adding by way of apology: "Those who have not the Greek cannot feel as a defect insertions of which they are unconscious; and so long as the words or sentences introduced agree generally with the thought and language of Homer, they are rather indebted to the translator for touches which to them must heighten the effect of the picture."

The other axiom laid down by Cowper—that no poetical version of Homer can be executed with any considerably close adherence to the form of the original without renouncing the trammels of *rhyme*—has not until recently been accepted with the same degree of unanimity. Hence we have seen many ingenious writers attempting in almost every variety of possible verse to overcome the insuperable difficulties which environed their self-imposed task. The results, in some cases, have been far from discreditable. W. Sotheby's translation of the Iliad and Odyssey entire,† and W. Munford's of the Iliad,‡ certainly both come under this category. The latter is the more interesting as the posthumous production of a gifted young countryman of our own, a native of Richmond, Va. The lamented President Felton, of Harvard University, has given the weighty sanction of his judgment to the opinion that this was "the best translation of the entire Iliad" as yet published.

Other translations, however, are by no means entitled to equal regard. One of the most singular productions that we are called upon to notice is a poem in whose composition the object seems to be quite as much to revive the old English as to furnish a version of Homer. Mr. W. G. T. Baxter is the author of this strange performance. (London, 1854.) He tells us that his Iliad "is offered as the most literal metrical English version of the Iliad hitherto published, and certainly the most is not only exceedingly free in its general rendering, but admits very considerable insertions and expansions, somewhat after the style of Chapman, and this to such an extent that a very favorable critic* is forced to observe: "It is needless, however, to dwell on a fault (if fault it be after all) which runs through the whole translation," adding by way of apology: "Those who have not the Greek cannot feel as a defect insertions of which they are unconscious; and so long as the words or sentences introduced agree generally with the thought and language of Homer, they are rather indebted to the translator for touches which to them must heighten the effect of the picture."

---

* In the "Edinburgh Review" for April, 1863.

† The Iliad and Odyssey, translated by W. Sotheby. Plates after the designs of Flaxman. 4 vols., 8vo. London, 1834.

‡ The Iliad, etc. 2 vols. Boston, 1846.

The other axiom laid down by Cowper—that no poetical version of Homer can be executed with any considerably close adherence to the form of the original without renouncing the trammels of rhyme—has not until recently been accepted with the same degree of unanimity. Hence we have seen many ingenious writers attempting in almost every variety of possible verse to overcome the insuperable difficulties which environed their self-imposed task. The results, in some cases, have been far from discreditable. W. Sotheby's translation of the Iliad and Odyssey entire,† and W. Munford's of the Iliad,‡ certainly both come under this category. The latter is the more interesting as the posthumous production of a gifted young countryman of our own, a native of Richmond, Va. The lamented President Felton, of Harvard University, has given the weighty sanction of his judgement to the opinion that this was "the best translation of the entire Iliad" as yet published.

Other translations, however, are by no means entitled to equal regard. One of the most singular productions that we are called upon to notice is a poem in whose composition the object seems to be quite as much to revive the old English as to furnish a version of Homer. Mr. W. G. T. Barter is the author of this strange performance. (London, 1854.) He tells us that his Iliad "is offered as the most literal metrical English version of the Iliad hitherto published, and certainly the most literal in rhyme. And in it the translator has aimed at giving all that is in the original, without regard to supposed redundancy or repetition, and from it as rigidly excluding every thought and expression which is not there to be found." Leaving entirely out of consideration the utter absence of poetical fire, of which we look in vain for a spark in this dreary waste, we find ourselves confronted at the very outset with difficulties scarcely inferior to those of mastering a new language. A formidable glossary is thrust before our eyes, in which we discover a small part of the uncouth forms whose acquaintance we are expected to make. To our consternation we learn that we shall be called upon to interpret *del* as "portion," *yare* as "nimbly," *y-fere* as "together," and *y-wis* as "verily;" that *appeach* is to "accuse," *brast*, to "break," and *lin*, to "give over" or "cease." Unfortunately the list of obsolete words and expressions, although by no means a short one, covers but a very small part of those which the translator has laboriously culled from Chaucer and other sources of English pure and undefiled. The pages fairly bristle with unintelligible terms, for the explanation of which he kindly refers us to a copious collection of notes. But worst of all, there is no compensation for the trouble to which we are thus coolly subjected, in any manly vigor—not to say enthusiasm—of the author. Even the dignity of the epic is lost, and we have such lines as these, taken from the first book, (line 60, etc.):

---

* In the "Edinburgh Review" for April 1831.

† The Iliad and Odyssey, translated by W. Sotheby. Illustrated by the designs of Flaxman. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1834.

‡ The Iliad, etc. 2 vols. Boston, 1846.

> "So spake, and with his dark brows Kronos' son
> Did nod. The locks ambrosial of the king
> *Y-quivered* from his head immortal down,
> And huge Olympus shook."

And a little further we meet with these:

> "The gods encountering
> Their Sire, all from their seats arose. None might
> His coming bide, but stood to meet him *every wight*."

Under the translation "*the all-renowned Both-feet-Lame*," the unclassical reader would certainly find it difficult to recognize the god Vulcan—*περικλυτὸς 'Αμφιγυήεις*.

In another article we shall take occasion to examine with greater particularity the later versions of Lord Derby and Mr. Bryant.

literal in rhyme. And in it the translator has aimed at giving all that is in the original, without regard to supposed redundancy or repetition, and from it as rigidly excluding every thought and expression which is not there to be found." Leaving entirely out of consideration the utter absence of poetical fire, of which we look in vain for a spark in this dreary waste, we find ourselves confronted at the very outset with difficulties scarcely inferior to those of mastering a new language. A formidable glossary is thrust before our eyes, in which we discover a small part of the uncouth forms whose acquaintance we are expected to make. To our consternation we learn that we shall be called upon to interpret *del* as "portion," *yare* as "nimbly," *y-fere* as "together," and *y-wis* as "verily;" that *appeach* is to "accuse," *brast*, to "break," and *fin*, to "give over" or "cease." Unfortunately the list of obsolete words and expressions, although by no means a short one, covers but a very small part of those which the translator has laboriously culled from Chaucer and other sources of English pure and undefiled. The pages fairly bristle with unintelligible terms, for the explanation of which he kindly refers us to a copious collection of notes. But worst of all, there is no compensation for the trouble to which we are thus easily subjected, in any manly vigor—not to say enthusiasm—of the author. Even the dignity of the epic is lost, and we have such lines as these, taken from the first book, (line 60, etc.):

"So spake, and with his dark brows Kronos' son
Did nod. The locks ambrosial of the king
Y-quivered from his head immortal down,
And huge Olympus shook."

And a little further we meet with these:

"The gods encountering
Their Sire, all from their seats arose. None might
His coming bide, but stood to meet him every wight."

Under the translation "*the all-renowned Haltfoot Fere*," the unclassical reader would certainly find it difficult to recognize the god Vulcan—περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις.

In another article we shall take occasion to examine with greater particularity the later versions of Lord Derby and Mr. Bryant.

ART. II.—RICHARD ROTHE.

"WE must assign to Rothe the very first place among the *speculative* divines of the present day. He surpasses even Nitzsch, Müller, Dorner, Martensen, and Baur in vigorous grasp and independence of thought, and is hardly inferior in this respect to Schleiermacher." "We regard his system of Theological Ethics as the greatest work on speculative divinity which has appeared since Schleiermacher's Dogmatics, full of power, boldness, and originality. It is truly a work of art as well as of science, and the several stones of the ethical system are reared up here into a magnificent Gothic cathedral by the skill of a master architect. Those who have formed their idea of this important science from such books as Dr. Wayland's popular Moral Philosophy will lose both sight and hearing before they have read two pages of this work. But those who are accustomed to go beneath the shallow surface of things to the fundamental principles and general laws of the moral universe, will feel amply repaid by a careful study of it, however often they may be compelled to differ *toto cœlo* from the author's views." *

It is natural to suppose that the passing away of a theologian who called forth, fifteen years before the close of his labors, so high an appreciation as the above from so competent a judge as Dr. Schaff, would cause a thrill of interest to pass throughout the whole circle of Christian thinkers; and in fact more than this has been the case. The thrill that vibrated through both continents at the news of August 20, 1867, that Richard Rothe had passed away, proved but the first pulsation of a stream of interest that flows unabated to the present hour. The Christian world was loath to realize that the creative thinker, the revered teacher, and the modestly and humbly adoring disciple of Christ, should no longer raise his peace-fraught voice for the cause of Christian charity and progress. But in this particular case the cloud of regret is silver-lined with more than the usual quantum of consolation. A man whose life is so intensely inward as was Rothe's, and whose soul has so fully uttered and enshrined itself in undying pages

---

* Philip Schaff: "Germany, its Universities," etc. 1857.

of diamond-set thought, and whose humbly reverent, Christ-like life stands so halo-clothed in the memories of that forty years' series of youthful disciples who hung upon his words of instruction, and drank in of his richly Christian personal example, dies much less wholly from the world than one whose working is more actively outward.

We purpose, in the following paper, a brief sketch of the life and significance of Richard Rothe, drawn almost wholly from a monograph by Ernst Achelis,* but as corroborated by Dr. Schaff's "Germany," etc., by Rothe's *Theologische Ethik* itself, and by various other sources.

Born of a well-to-do family in Posen, January 28, 1799, Rothe grew up the *sole* child of his parents, and was even hindered by sickness until his eighth year from almost all association with like-aged playmates from without; when he once grew able to form such association, it was suddenly severed by the removal of the family (1809) to Stettin, and almost before he felt at home here his father was called (1811) to Breslau. In Stettin he attended the gymnasium two years. In Breslau he began to experience the spring-time pulsations of the self-reconstructing German national life that ensued on the falling off of the French yoke; but these momentous outward events were again unfavorable to any healthful social life in the young scholar, though they must have deeply and sublimely influenced his impressible heart. The Scriptures and the writings of the "romantic" school formed now his favorite reading. At Easter, 1817, he entered the University of Heidelberg. He calls his life here "a poetico-religioso-scientific idyl." The writings of Schelling here made upon him an almost bewildering impression. His other most preferred reading was St. Paul and Luther. The patriotic spirit dominant among the youth at Heidelberg soon drew him into its current, but he remained a stranger to the conventional rowdyhood of university life; and yet the "little prince," (as his fellow-students were wont to call him,) notwithstanding that he uniformly appeared in dress-coat and with cylinder-crowned head, suffered by no means from unpopularity. But

---

* "Dr. Richard Rothe." Gotha, 1869. Achelis is a student and ardent admirer of Rothe, but, being thoroughly orthodox, dissents from his master on important points, and, on the whole, presents an impartial and justly appreciative picture.

his purest pleasure he found in solitary walks among the surrounding glories of nature, or in communion with Fritz Krauss, the first and only congenial friend he here met with. In August, 1819, he left Heidelberg, and, after a journey through Switzerland and Upper Italy, renewed his studies in Berlin. Schleiermacher was as yet uncongenial to him, for he could not comprehend how one could take such liberties with the gospel history and yet believe in Christ. His first real Christian *communion* he here found in a circle of Pietists, though he was also greatly attracted by the spirit of the "Neandrians."

God had led him thus far in solitude, had led him through the wilderness, but had gently striven with him from earliest childhood. Though of Rationalistic raising, he felt powerfully attracted by the supernatural element of Christianity; and though the chilling services of the Church were almost repulsive to him, he had never lost the feeling which came upon him while but a four-year-old boy, namely, that he was destined to be a preacher. Notwithstanding that his Rationalistic instruction for confirmation failed of all religious influence upon him, yet he found in the study of the Bible the richest food for his heart; and prayer became his sweetest luxury, and that, too, prayer to the Saviour, notwithstanding all his fears lest thereby he should throw God into the background. A decisive heart-awakening at this period filled him with deep shame at his moral condition, and showed him the necessity of regeneration; but, strange to say, though he took no offense at the miraculous element of the Bible, and though he saw with growing clearness the necessity of clarifying human reason with the divine reason, and though faith continues to be for him the sole key to the highest knowledge, and Christ the proper object of faith, though the symbols of the Church form, in his eyes, the settled totality of truth, preclusive of all criticism, and though the Bible stands unassailable in its supernatural beauty, still he bears in himself the living consciousness of having derived his fundamental principles and views neither from the Bible nor from the creeds; rather did he seem to have drawn them from the depths of his own divinely-quickened soul, and from loving communion with the life of exalted Christian spirits.

It is a manifest kindness of Providence, that, in making his

transition from the isolation of his individual life into the stir of a wider Christian communion, Rothe was thrown into so pure a current of Pietistic Christianity as received him at Berlin. He became himself a Pietist, though at first only in a very temperate degree, until 1821, when the seminary at Wittenberg (whither, on the advice of Neander, Rothe had betaken himself in 1820) was thrown into a highly revived spiritual life by the influence of Rudolf Stier and Emil Krummacher. Here Rothe, who was never able long to resist powerful spiritual influences, and whose "womanly" nature lacked, to some degree, independence, gave himself almost entirely into the hands of the potent-spirited Stier. He became "an honest but not happy Pietist—a Pietist for conscience' sake, but without true happiness," as he himself says. His individuality was too strongly developed to admit of being thrown passively into a new shape; and though he here discovered new lacks in his own heart, and was thus led to a closer personal relation to Christ, still he grew thoroughly conscious that technical Pietism was not *the* form of Christianity most congenial to his individuality. For the present, however, he tarried in this *stadium* of his development.

After his betrothal with Louise von Brück, December, 1821, he preached for awhile in Breslau for a sick pastor. Here he was greatly benefited by intercourse with Julius Müller, with Steffens, and with the pious family Gröben, as well as encouraged by the success of his pastoral activity; but true inner satisfaction he did not yet enjoy. God, however, soon opened for him a path in which his inner life was enabled to come to the most joyous and fruitful development. He was appointed as preacher to the Prussian embassy in Rome. Late in 1823 he was examined for the second time, then ordained, then married, (November 10,) and soon thereafter (January 14, 1824) arrived in the world-metropolis.

Here begins for him a new spiritual epoch. As formerly with Luther in Rome, so now there springs up in Rothe, in sharpest contrast to Catholicism, the *religioso-moral* view of Christianity to which he subsequently gave, in his "Theological Ethics," so classic an expression. Under the repellant influence of Catholicism and the formative influence of Christian association with his little communion of cultivated Protestants, and transition from the isolation of his individual life into the air of a wider Christian communion, Rothe was thrown into so pure a current of Pietistic Christianity as received him at Berlin. He became himself a Pietist, though at first only in a very temperate degree, until 1821, when the seminary at Wittenberg (whither, on the advice of Neander, Rothe had betaken himself in 1820) was thrown into a highly revived spiritual life by the influence of Rudolf Stier and Emil Krummacher. Here Rothe, who was never able long to resist powerful spiritual influences, and whose "womanly" nature lacked, to some degree, independence, gave himself almost entirely into the hands of the potent-spirited Stier. He became "an honest but not happy Pietist—a Pietist for conscience' sake, but without true happiness," as he himself says. His individuality was too strongly developed to admit of being thrown passively into a new shape; and though he here discovered new lacks in his own heart, and was thus led to a closer personal relation to Christ, still he grew thoroughly conscious that technical Pietism was not the form of Christianity most congenial to his individuality. For the present, however, he tarried in this stadium of his development.

After his betrothal with Louise von Brück, December, 1822, he preached for awhile in Breslau for a sick pastor. Here he was greatly benefited by intercourse with Julius Müller, with Steffens, and with the pious family Groben, as well as encouraged by the success of his pastoral activity; but true inner satisfaction he did not yet enjoy. God, however, soon opened for him a path in which his inner life was enabled to come to the most joyous and fruitful development. He was appointed as preacher to the Prussian embassy in Rome. Late in 1823 he was examined for the second time, then ordained, then married, (November 16,) and soon thereafter (January 14, 1824) arrived in the world-metropolis.

Here begins for him a new spiritual epoch. As formerly with Luther in Rome, so now there springs up in Rothe, in sharpest contrast to Catholicism, the religio-moral view of Christianity to which he subsequently gave, in his "Theological Ethics," so classic an expression. Under the repellant influence of Catholicism and the formative influence of Christian association with his little communion of cultivated Protestants, and especially with certain richly endowed individuals, such as Bunsen and Reinhold, the cramping bonds of Pietism fell away, and his fructified individuality rose to a nobler and grander form of Christian thought and life. His faith in Christ as *his* Saviour soars on joyous wing, his impulse to prayer awakes to new strength, his inner life comes into equable and harmonious flow, and a new form of theology begins to take life within him. After four years of labor in Rome he accepts, with inner hesitation, a call to the fourth professorship in the Wittenberg Seminary. After a journey of recreation through Italy he entered upon his new duties in September, 1828.

The duties which awaited him in Wittenberg, especially his course of instruction on the history of Christianity, led him to more than five years of critical study in Church History, while his close personal relations to the students and professors of the seminary helped him to a more complete acquaintance with the chief currents of thought in the theology of the day. The July revolution (1830) awakened in Rothe the *political* sense, and his peculiar views on the relation of politics to morality, and of Christianity in its humanistic significancy, begin to assume settled consistency. His exegetical, dogmatical, and ethical labors with the students led him to a clarification of his individual views, and occasioned his appearance as an author at the ripe age of thirty-nine. His first attempt, an exegesis on Rom. v, 12–21, is soon followed by a larger work, the "Beginnings of the Christian Church and of its Constitution," a book which brought to him, in 1837, a call from the Baden Government to a professorship in Heidelberg, and to the organizing there of a theological seminary. His first course of lectures in Heidelberg (theological ethics) led him to treat of this science in a new and speculative manner, and in 1842, on recovering from a severe sickness, he laid vigorous hand to the actual composition of this, his master-work, "Theological Ethics," whereof the first two volumes appeared in 1845, and the third in 1848.

Thus far Rothe's outward life had passed quietly and peacefully. He was at full liberty here in Heidelberg to enjoy undisturbed his "monkish seclusiveness," as he himself calls it, and his disinclination to worldly activity was increased by what he saw of the workings of demagogy and of enthusiastic Church especially, with certain richly endowed individuals, such as Bunsen and Niebuhr, the cramping bonds of Pietism fell away, and his fructified individuality rose to a nobler and grander form of Christian thought and life. His faith in Christ as his Saviour soars on joyous wing, his impulse to prayer awakes to new strength, his inner life comes into equable and harmonious flow, and a new form of theology begins to take life within him. After four years of labor in Rome he accepts, with inner hesitation, a call to the fourth professorship in the Wittenberg Seminary. After a journey of recreation through Italy he entered upon his new duties in September, 1828.

The duties which awaited him in Wittenberg, especially his course of instruction on the history of Christianity, led him to more than five years of critical study in Church History, while his close personal relations to the students and professors of the seminary helped him to a more complete acquaintance with the chief currents of thought in the theology of the day. The July revolution (1830) awakened in Rothe the political sense, and his peculiar views on the relation of politics to morality, and of Christianity in its humanistic significancy, begin to assume settled consistency. His exegetical, dogmatical, and ethical labors with the students led him to a clarification of his individual views, and occasioned his appearance as an author at the ripe age of thirty-nine. His first writings, an exegesis on Rom. v, 12-21, is soon followed by a larger work, the "Beginnings of the Christian Church and of its Constitution," a book which brought to him, in 1837, a call from the Baden Government to a professorship in Heidelberg, and to the organizing there of a theological seminary. His first course of lectures in Heidelberg (theological ethics) led him to treat of this science in a new and speculative manner, and in 1842, on recovering from a severe sickness, he laid vigorous hand to the actual composition of this, his master-work, "Theological Ethics," whereof the first two volumes appeared in 1845, and the third in 1848.

Thus far Rothe's outward life had passed quietly and peacefully. He was at full liberty here in Heidelberg to enjoy undisturbed his "monkish seclusiveness," as he himself calls it, and his disinclination to worldly activity was increased by what he saw of the workings of demagogy and of enthusiastic Church reformers in political and churchly affairs. In 1848 he was called to the protectorate of the University. The revolutionary storms of the time, which raged with unusual violence in Baden, together with the severe duties of his twofold office at the Seminary and at the University in Heidelberg, seem to have rendered his position undesirable. At any rate, he dissolved the bonds which united him with his colleagues, and in the same year (1848) accepted a call to Bonn. Of the five years here spent very few landmarks remain ; Rothe regarded them as "an episode which, though not without fruit, was chiefly important in teaching him what his calling was *not*." The fact is, the busily outwardly-practical Westphalian Church life, which had its center in the Bonn University, was uncongenial to Rothe's retiring, subjective tendency. He could not stand the "close air" of the pastoral conferences there prevalent, and after his friend and colleague, Dorner, had left Bonn for Göttingen, he gladly accepted a recall to Heidelberg, after having rejected a call to the prelacy at Carlsruhe, "in order not to travesty himself." The last fourteen years of his life, from 1853, Rothe passed in Heidelberg, six years in solitary devotion to his lectures and studies, while, during the last eight, unfortunate influences combined to throw him into an unnatural active co-operation with the purposes of the unorthodox *Protestantenverein*. Deeply as multitudinous friends regret his yielding to this influence, they yet rejoice in abundant evidence that his inward heart pulsated to the last as true as ever with the great heart of the true Church of Christ.

But this meager outward form of Rothe's life was filled with a rich and many-sided life-content such as Church history has few other equals to offer. The one central point of his broadly and richly developed character was, as Dr. Zittel, his funeral preacher, has justly said, *his love to his Saviour*. "This man had a delicate ear for the question, Lovest thou *me?* He never disregarded it, and never gave himself rest until, from the depths of his soul, he could give it his *Yes*." Rothe was an unmistakable exemplification of what he himself has affirmed as the necessary requirement of every true Christian life : "The image of Christ must fill the holy of holies in the Christian's consciousness, and pour out therefrom its light into all the chambers of his inner being, so that in this light he shall see

every thing, do every thing, and live whatever he lives." It is a beautiful instance of pure humility and of deep self-knowledge when Rothe "can find in himself only a person who has and is little else than that by God's grace (he knows not how) he possesses an eye and heart wherewith he is able to see and lay hold upon his Saviour, and thereby also his God, and at the same time, to his ineffable delight, finds himself in the midst of a world out of which a thousand-voiced chorus of humbly adoring voices, far outringing the mighty cry of sin and misery, and of all other dissonances, chants to him from day to day in ever-varying and ever-mightier strains the praise and glory of their Creator and Saviour." Such was the deep and profoundly ethical love whereby Rothe laid hold upon, and lived in vital union with, the living Christ. There was a spiritual air about the man, a marvelous witchery in his being, that made all who came within the sphere of his attraction feel that they had to do with one in whom Christ had, in an unusual degree, taken form. Hence the mysterious power that wrought so irresistibly on the hearts of his pupils, so that they could not but love him, and that, too, all the more and the deeper the longer they tarried in the sunshine of his life. Nor was it merely in transient moments, or in especially earnest hours, but constantly and on all occasions—whether while teaching science from his desk, or while breaking the word of life to the people from the pulpit—whether at the joyous festal board, or when giving solitary counsel to bewildered and doubting consciences—that Rothe was environed with this holy atmosphere. In joviality and seriousness, in mourning and in joy, his life-communion with Christ made itself blessedly felt. It was a rare exemplification of the maxim, "Pray without ceasing:" at the same time there was an utter absence in him of all formal gravity, of all stiff seriousness.

Ever memorable to pupils and hearers are those hours when the beloved Rothe took, as the subject of his thoughts, the holy central-point of his own life, "his Lord Christ;" ever memorable the transfiguration of his countenance, the low tremulousness of his voice, (as if it were not befitting to speak loudly of such a subject,) and the involuntary feeling of a holy Presence that filled the auditorium. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of making here a brief extract from the preface with

which, in 1845, Rothe introduced the first volume of his Ethics to the scientific public—words which set in a beautiful light his tender and reverential love to Christ. "Of all the misunderstandings," writes he, "to which my book will unavoidably be exposed, only *one* of them seriously disquiets me; for the others can affect only my own person, in regard to which I am not especially sensitive. But I would certainly wish never to have laid pen to this work, should the public not perceive that its central animating principle is unconditional faith in Christ as the real and sole Redeemer, and love to him. The corner-stone of all my thinking, I may honestly confess, is the simple Christian faith as it (not under the form of any special dogma or theology) has for eighteen centuries been conquering the world. It is for me the ultimate certainty, for which I am unhesitatingly and joyously ready to cast to the bats every other pretended knowledge which conflicts therewith. I know of no other solid ground upon which, both for my entire human existence and also especially for my thinking, I could cast anchor, aside from the historical phenomenon designated by the holy name Jesus Christ. It is, for me, the unassailable *sanctum sanctorum* of humanity; the highest element that ever came into a human consciousness; a bright sunrise in history, wherefrom alone light beams out over the totality of objects which lie about us in the universe. With this single absolutely uninventable *datum*, the knowledge of which witnesses directly to its reality, as light witnesses of itself, and in which lie locked up infinite consequences, stands or falls, for me, definitively every certainty of the spiritual, and hence eternal, dignity of the human being."

With this love to "his Lord Christ" were united in Rothe the greatest unselfishness and humility. His constant desire was to work, not for his own honor, but for that of Christ, and to win hearts, not for himself, but for the truth. The mere thought, that from among the stream of students that was constantly going out into the world from his instruction there might form itself a kind of school in theology, was to Rothe positively distressing. On parting with the young men who had sat entranced at his feet, he was accustomed honestly to say, "Pray do your best to shake *me* off from you." Though the greatest honors were showed him as a scientific theologian, he remained utterly free of scholastic vanity. "I foresee plainly,"

wrote he in 1847, "that if any place is awarded me in the house of theology, it will be in the little chamber of theosophs, close by Œtinger, that I will come to stand. I belong really nowhere else, and I wish for no better place. I shall feel inwardly well at the feet of this dear man." Elsewhere he says, "I know that in the choir of modern theology I sing simply *the* part for which God has endowed me, and I sing this quite alone, because it is a very subordinate part. . . . If I simply know that I sing in this *choir*, then I am satisfied. Do I then deserve blame for undertaking a work in the household of our theology which seems to all others either too humble or too pains-giving? To me, at least, it is just as I could wish. I do my work quietly and alone, without finding fault with others for seeing things differently."

Another characteristic of his humility was, his cheerful frankness in correcting any formerly expressed view which was discovered to be erroneous. Take, as an illustration, this statement from the second edition of his Ethics: "In the first edition of this book I was very unfortunate in the treatment of the point developed in this paragraph. As it is there presented, I must have been understood in a manner which, while entirely contrary to my *real* meaning, was yet wholly my own fault." Such frank unselfishness could not but win its way into all hearts. "We do not believe," says Achelis, "that there has been another teacher in the schools of Germany who was in such a degree as Rothe beloved by his hearers, and, as it were, borne on their hands." And as by the students, so also by his colleagues in all the faculties, as also by the citizens of Heidelberg, was the kindly and highly-renowned, and yet lowly-minded professor, met with the affectionate good-will which he himself constantly showed to all.

While exercising the severest criticism on his own labors he was of a mildness and generosity in the judging of others such as is rarely to be seen under such circumstances. He not only held the highest possible opinion of his fellows, but even in cases of sad disappointment persisted to the very last in saving from the wreck of this good opinion whatever could be saved. Wonderful was his facility in thinking himself into the standpoint from which another viewed and judged things, and in making the greatest possible allowance for the effects of tem-

perament and peculiar circumstances. He was even too ready subjectively to justify those whom objectively he had to condemn. "Every-where," says Zittel, "he knew how to bear men in his love, for in all men he found something good. His soul knew nothing of hatred. When, after administering to him the eucharist, I remarked, 'You are dying in peace with God,' he joyously answered, 'Yes, and in peace with men. It is a great grace of God that he has so led me as that bitterness against a human being has never been able to find root in my heart.'" And this extraordinary love to man on the part of Rothe was of the *right* quality, thoroughly ethically tempered, and sprung from love to his Lord. Even of his own personal piety Rothe held very lightly. Well known are the precious words [evidently an amiable self-deception] published in a religious journal in 1864 under befitting circumstances, namely, "I will allow myself no contention as to the personal motives of the individuals in question, but I simply leave them to the Searcher of hearts, and besides add this concession, that for my own part I cannot psychologically induce myself to hold any one whomsoever for a worse Christian than myself." And how lovely sound the same sentiments, as given in writing to his friends from his death-bed, namely, that they should not, in any supposed interest of his good name, allow a single word to fall which might offend any of his opponents, "of whom he had always sincerely held more highly than of himself." Another beautiful trait of the departed great man was his gladness to *learn* from the experience of other Christians, old and young. His felt need for communion in prayer was so deep as to lead him, on parting even from young students, to make the earnest request, "Pray for me."

It is true, that with his deep knowledge of himself Rothe could not but know that in his personal religion much was given to him; but because it was *given* to him he praised the grace of God alone which had given it to him. "I hold it," wrote he in 1864, "for a *precious* thing when one can joyously believe in a God who *does miracles*. . . . Precious and blessed is it indeed when one can *so* believe; but *when* one can do so then is it *grace*, and one does not *boast* of grace."

Such was Rothe's religious character, and such he preserved it till death. "His Lord Christ," who had been the life of his perament and peculiar circumstances. He was even too ready subjectively to justify those whom objectively he had to condemn. "Every-where," says Zittel, "he knew how to bear men in his love, for in all men he found something good. His soul knew nothing of hatred. When, after administering to him the eucharist, I remarked, 'You are dying in peace with God,' he joyously answered, 'Yes, and in peace with men. It is a great grace of God that he has so led me as that bitterness against a human being has never been able to find root in my heart.'" And this extraordinary love to men on the part of Rothe was of the right quality, thoroughly ethically tempered, and sprung from love to his Lord. Even of his own personal piety Rothe held very lightly. Well known are the precious words (evidently an unfeigned self-description) published in a religious journal in 1844 under befitting circumstances, namely, "I will allow myself no contention as to the personal motives of the individuals in question, but I simply leave them to the Searcher of hearts, and besides add this confession, that for my own part I cannot psychologically induce myself to hold any one whomsoever for a worse Christian than myself." And how lovely sound the same sentiments, as given in writing to his friends from his death-bed, namely, that they should not, in any supposed interest of his good name, allow a single word to fall which might offend any of his opponents, "of whom he had always sincerely held more highly than of himself." Another beautiful trait of the departed great man was his gladness to learn from the experience of other Christians, old and young. His felt need for communion in prayer was so deep as to lead him, on parting even from young students, to make the earnest request, "Pray for me."

It is true, that with his deep knowledge of himself Rothe could not but know that in his personal religion much was given to him; but because it was given to him he praised the grace of God alone which had given it to him. "I hold it," wrote he in 1864, "for a precious thing when one can joyously believe in a God who does miracles . . . Precious and blessed is it indeed when one can so believe; but when one can do so thus is it grace, and one does not boast of grace."

Such was Rothe's religious character, and such he preserved it till death. "His Lord Christ," who had been the life of his life, continued to be his love and his life until his last breath. To his weeping friends at his death-bed he said, "I die in the faith in which I have lived—I die in the name of Jesus, and I think I understand to some degree what it means to die in the name of Jesus." In his last moments he said, "I trust I may now go home."

Having thus briefly sketched Rothe's outward and inward life, we hope to have prepared the way for some correct appreciation of him as a preacher and theologian.

It might well be anticipated that with so thoroughly a Christ-penetrated heart, Rothe could not well lack in preaching potency. *Pectus est, quod disertum facit;* and it was his *pectus*, his heart, in its rich acquaintance with Jesus, that he laid open and bare in his sermons. It is well known that during the last ten or twelve years Rothe entered the pulpit but rarely. Whenever word got out that he was to preach, however, the news spread through the town like wild-fire, and the densely crowded University Church, as well as the solemn stillness that prevailed while he preached, evidenced both of the devotion of the hearers and of their love for the preacher. But wherein lay the secret of his power? Not in his voice or gestures, for his voice was too slender and high-pitched, and in his general bearing there was a certain agitatedness that could not possibly attract. Nor was this power in the depth of his thoughts, or in the new light that he shed upon the darker mysteries of the Christian faith. So far was this from being the case, that one did not discover in the preacher the least trace of the professor. Rothe thought too highly of the evangelical office to beglitter or becloud the simple objective Gospel doctrines by a display of human speculation. His preferred subjects were the plainest precepts of practical religion, such as "seeking first the kingdom of God" or "believing in the risen Saviour." And *what* he said was generally familiar to every believing Christian; but *how* he said it, how he brought it irresistibly before the conscience—that was the secret of his extraordinary power. And this was the characteristic of, and the impression made by, his preaching on all classes of minds throughout his career. Nippold relates the incident, that after Rothe had convinced an eminent disciple of Stahl, in an earnest debate, that with such views the latter would necessarily have been an opponent of Luther in

the sixteenth century, and that after the latter had related in the further course of conversation that he had never heard the faith preached with such warmth and earnestness as he had heard done many years since by a namesake of Rothe in Rome, he was no little surprised to learn the identity of his admired Roman preacher with his present doughty opponent.

The publication (1868) by Schenkel* of the sermons left by Rothe enables us to see that the deceased was animated from the very start with the same vital Christianity, save only that it grew deeper and richer as experience advanced.

The works which Rothe himself published are not very voluminous. He had a dislike of imitating the perverted much-writing of the day by committing the same fault himself. What he has published, however, will always command respect both for its solidity and for its thoroughness of conviction. His "Beginnings of the Christian Church" (1837) fixed upon him the attention of the whole theological world. But the peculiar view here taken of the relation of the Church to the State hindered it from a popularity which, in other respects, it richly merited. A Latin dissertation, "*De disciplinæ arcani Origine*," (1841,) is also of great value. A brief contribution to dogmatics (three essays on the idea of dogmatics, on revelation, and inspiration) appeared in 1863 and 1869. Of his lectures on Church history, which he constantly gave alongside of his other four courses of lectures, (Elucidation of the Synoptic Gospels, Life of Christ, Dogmatics, and Ethics,) he has published nothing. Their great worth lay in the masterly manner in which he merged his hearers into the spirit of the past, and deduced therefrom practical lessons for the present and future. But Rothe's chief work, that in which his whole mind and heart were poured out, is his "Theological Ethics," (3 vols., 1846–48; 2d ed., 1867,) and it is in the light of this book that his significance for theology will be definitely measured.

In his theology Rothe was in the highest possible sense a supernaturalist. "So far as I know myself," writes he, "I cannot discover in me the least anti-supranaturalistic artery, and just as little a pantheistic one, nor have I *ever* felt even the sixteenth century, and that after the latter had related to the further course of conversation that he had never heard the faith preached with such warmth and earnestness as he had heard done many years since by a namesake of Rothe in Rome, he was no little surprised to learn the identity of his admired Roman preacher with his present dogmatic opponent.

---

* Schenkel has made of this publication a "literary scandal," in that he has taken the liberty to "emend" these sermons in the sense of the new anti-orthodoxy of Baden, with which Rothe in his latter eight years had some outer connection.

The publication (1868) by Schenkel * of the sermons left by Rothe enables us to see that the deceased was animated from the very start with the same vital Christianity, save only that it grew deeper and richer as experience advanced.

The works which Rothe himself published are not very voluminous. He had a dislike of imitating the perverted much-writing of the day by committing the same fault himself. What he has published, however, will always command respect both for its solidity and for its thoroughness of conviction. His "Beginnings of the Christian Church" (1837) fixed upon him the attention of the whole theological world. But the peculiar view here taken of the relation of the Church to the State hindered it from a popularity which, in other respects, it richly merited. A Latin dissertation, "*De disciplinæ arcani Origine*," (1841,) is also of great value. A brief contribution to dogmatics (three essays on the idea of dogmatics, on revelation, and inspiration) appeared in 1858 and 1860. Of his lectures on Church history, which he constantly gave alongside of his other four courses of lectures, (Elucidation of the Synoptic Gospels, Life of Christ, Dogmatics, and Ethics,) he has published nothing. Their great worth lay in the masterly manner in which he merged his hearers into the spirit of the past, and deduced therefrom practical lessons for the present and future. But Rothe's chief work, that in which his whole mind and heart were poured out, is his "Theological Ethics," (3 vols. 1845–48; 2d ed., 1867,) and it is in the light of this book that his significance for theology will be definitely measured.

In his theology Rothe was in the highest possible sense a supernaturalist. "So far as I know myself," writes he, "I cannot discover in me the least anti-supernaturalistic artery; and just as little a pantheistic one, nor have I ever felt even the least temptation to either error; indeed, I have often wished that all temptations had remained as far from me as these." But supranaturalistic as his theology is, it is peculiar in its freedom both as to the defined dogmas of the Church and as to the philosophical schools of the day. It took root in his inner sanctified consciousness, and developed itself independently with the growth of his spiritual life, and under the sunshine of his personal communion with Christ. Its proper designation is theosophy. It is in Rothe that the tendency that lay obscurely in Tauler, Böhme, Œtinger, etc., was exalted to the dignity of a science. The peculiarity of this science as created by Rothe is, that it reduces the multiplicity of the universe to harmony and unity, and develops the whole system of being with logical necessity out of a single unitary principle. This starting-point is the communion of the Christian individual with God as rendered possible by Christ, a communion that is so certain and positive, and so fruitful in inevitable consequences, that the Christian may, with much more confidence than Descartes started out from his *Cogito ergo sum,* take as the basis of all theological speculation the unassailable principle, *Cogito, ergo Deus est.*

---

* Schenkel has made of this publication a "literary scandal," in that he has taken the liberty to "correct" these sermons in the sense of the new [illegible] of Baden, with which Rothe in his latter eight years had many [illegible]

This suggests the difference between philosophical and theological speculation: the former sets out from the self-consciousness, the self-certainty, as the first and definite certainty; the latter goes out from the God-consciousness, the God-certainty, as the primal and highest certainty. Hence the requirement of Christian piety as the *conditio sine qua non* of theological speculating, inasmuch as only the Christianly-pious subject can possess the indispensable starting-point. In this personally-realized communion with God, whereby the self-consciousness becomes at the same time a God-consciousness, dialectics now sets its lever. The absolute being of God is differentiated into a plurality of ideas, and out of these ideas result, by the simplest logical process, new ideas, and these in turn, in progressive differentiation, furnish still other ideas, at first in mere linear outlines, and then in firmer consistency, and all by process of simple rational necessity. And how magnificent the thought-structure that thus rises before our eyes! We behold God himself, the infinite and glorious One, logically *become*, from the stage of mere absolute being to that of the least temptation to either error; indeed, I have often wished that all temptations had remained as far from me as these." But supernaturalistic as his theology is, it is peculiar in its freedom both as to the defined dogmas of the Church and as to the philosophical schools of the day. It took root in his deep sanctified consciousness, and developed itself independently with the growth of his spiritual life, and under the condition of his personal communion with Christ. Its proper designation is theosophy. It is in Rothe that the tendency that lay obscurely in Tauler, Böhme, Oetinger, etc., was exalted to the dignity of a science. The peculiarity of this scheme as created by Rothe is, that it reduces the multiplicity of the universe to harmony and unity, and develops the whole system of being with logical necessity out of a single unitary principle. This starting-point is the communion of the Christian individual with God as rendered possible by Christ, a communion that is so certain and positive, and so fruitful in inevitable consequences, that the Christian may, with much more confidence than Descartes started out from his *Cogito ergo sum*, take as the basis of all theological speculation the unassailable principle, *Cogito, ergo Deus est*.

This suggests the difference between philosophical and theological speculation: the former sets out from the self-consciousness, the self-certainty, as the first and definite certainty; the latter goes out from the God-consciousness, the God-certainty, as the primal and highest certainty. Hence the requirement of Christian piety as the *conditio sine qua non* of theological speculating, inasmuch as only the Christianly-pious subject can possess the indispensable starting-point. In this personally-realized communion with God, whereby the self-consciousness becomes at the same time a God-consciousness, dialectics now sets its lever. The absolute being of God is differentiated into a plurality of ideas, and out of these ideas result, by the simplest logical process, new ideas, and these in turn, in progressive differentiation, furnish still other ideas, at first in mere linear outlines, and then in fuller concreteness, and all by process of simple rational necessity. And how magnificent the thought-structure that thus rises before our eyes! We behold God himself, the infinite and glorious One, logically become, from the stage of mere absolute being to that of the concrete absolute person, in boundless fullness of life transcending all mere human thought; or, rather, it is not God, but the *idea* of God, that we see become, that we behold rise in all its majesty above our mental horizon—an idea which after all simply stamps upon the simplest child-conception of Him, the seal of scientific truth. From the absolute person of God the dialectical stream now pours itself into a richer bed. The entire fullness of the infinitely diversified creation, not merely of the present *eon*, but also of past preparatory *eons*, rises, *becomes*, before our vision.

We become witnesses of the divine creation; the entire cosmos rises progressively into being, until, with man, the crown of creation, the *ethical* work begins, which, after a long and gradual development, comes to repose in the perfected kingdom of God, preparatory to the ineffable glory of the future world. This future world of pure spirit has developed itself out of the earthly world through God-inspired moral human effort. It is the goal of that moral humanity which has found its eternal center and enlivening power in Christ, who brings to one all things in heaven and earth. In perfected, spiritualized humanity the Absolute Spirit, that is, God, who is the principle of all becoming, has found his other *ego*, which his eternal thought had posited from eternity; earth has become heaven.

In the presence of this momentous thought-structure, this "anatomatizing" of the thought of God, the reader is struck with amazement; and were it not for the unction of reverential piety that breathes throughout the whole system, it would be difficult not to think the author presumptuous and daring. This would, however, be the very contrary of the fact. Rothe's relation to his system was one of profoundly Christian modesty and humility. "I have no desire," writes he, "to maintain that I am in the right against any one; I only ask that I be not denied the right of finding satisfaction for my own part in no other thinking than in a thinking out of *one* piece and current, which, in the nature of the case, must be of a strictly speculative character. I know even positively that I am wrong, for indeed I can at best only have dipped up one drop out of the ocean." "Were I asked whether I found *full* satisfaction in my written work, I could only smile. Woe to me if God and the world are not transcendently greater than *my* idea of the concrete absolute person, in boundless fulness of his transcending all mere human thought; or, rather, it is not God, but the *idea* of God, that we see become, that we behold rise in all its majesty above our mental horizon—an idea which after all simply stamps upon the simplest child-conception of Him, the seal of scientific truth. From the absolute person of God the dialectical stream now pours itself into a richer bed. The entire fulness of the infinitely diversified creation, not merely of the present æon, but also of past preparatory ones, rises, *becomes*, before our vision.

We become witnesses of the divine creation; the creation rises progressively into being, until, with man, the crown of creation, the *ethical* work begins, which, after a long and gradual development, comes to repose in the perfected kingdom of God, preparatory to the ineffable glory of the future world. This future world of pure spirit has developed itself out of the earthly world through God-inspired moral human effort. It is the goal of that moral humanity which has found its eternal center and enlivening power in Christ, who brings to one all things in heaven and earth. In perfected, spiritualized humanity the Absolute Spirit, that is, God, who is the principle of all becoming, has found his other ego, which his eternal thought had posited from eternity; earth has become heaven.

In the presence of this momentous thought-structure, this "autonomizing" of the thought of God, the reader is struck with amazement; and were it not for the unction of reverential piety that breathes throughout the whole system, it would be difficult not to think the author presumptuous and daring. This would, however, be the very contrary of the fact. Rothe's relation to his system was one of profoundly Christian modesty and humility. "I have no desire," writes he, "to maintain that I am in the right against any one; I only ask that I be not denied the right of finding satisfaction for my own part in no other thinking than in a thinking out of one piece and current, which, in the nature of the case, must be of a strictly speculative character. I know even positively that I am wrong, for indeed I can at best only have dipped up one drop out of the ocean." "Were I asked whether I found *full* satisfaction in my written work, I could only smile. Woe to me if God and the world are not transcendently greater than my idea of them!" "I can well distinguish between speculation and *my* speculation, and I have not the remotest dream of attributing to my thoughts *strict* objectivity. I know well enough that my thoughts are individually colored."

What Rothe, then, intends his system to be, is simply this: A presentation of objective eternal truth in so far as the individual is able, under the limitations of his individuality, to grasp and clearly express it. His presumption is only to be a colaborer in the effort of the human spirit to grasp absolute Truth, and to solve the problems of human existence. And in this work he uses the weapons which, as he thinks, Providence has designed him to use. It is only his *method* that distinguishes Rothe from the other theologians of the day; while, among the latter, the (nature-historical) inductive method, which rises from the specific to the generic, predominates, Rothe has applied with great scientific ability the intuitive method.

Against this method, however, there seems to lie one weighty objection, namely, its relation to the Scriptures. Inductive theologians derive their dogmas directly from the Bible. Rothe's system seems to have no other norm than the pious consciousness of the subject. We must not forget, however, that it is only the *Christianly pious* subject—he in whom the spirit of the Bible has become, so to speak, immanent—who is regarded as fitted for theological speculation. And then at the close of the thought-process the resultant system is to be submitted to the test of Scripture, and thus to stand or fall. And Rothe himself never wearied in reiterating to his hearers that he was ready to cast to the bats every page he had written, could he be persuaded that it did not clearly harmonize with the word of God.

The advantages of the intuitional method Rothe thought to be these: By the usual method one attains somewhat nearly to the ideas and views that lie at the bottom of the Bible; but there remains an incommensurable element, a kind of "enamel," an unutterably delicate and fragrant spirit, that breathes through the Scriptures that does not come to appreciation. Hence it is necessary to enter upon another way, and, in fact, in one sense the very way in which the apostles and prophets attained to their revelations. For us it is the way of intuition. It behooves to rise to the point of the interpenetration of God and

man, and to think out from God, with our sanctified reason, the same thoughts which God, in virtue of his reason, had precedently thought, and brought near to man in his revelations and providence. As the thoughts of God are rational, and as the reason of sanctified man is purified and renewed after the image of God, hence the thoughts contained in divine revelation must be attainable in the way indicated. That which apostles and prophets obtained by special inspiration, must be attained to by the God-imbued general subject through the simple process of thought. And the truth thus attained to is no longer a cold, skeleton-like outline, but stands forth in vital originality and in fragrance and life.

It is not unintentionally that Rothe entitled the systematic presentation of his mature thoughts on the whole circle of objective truth—God, nature, and man—a treatise on "Theological *Ethics*." In his view all true doctrines have an ethical significancy—issue in life. Christianity is more than *mere* religion; it is a transfigured life and existence of humanity. "The Redeemer is no cleric or priest, but a high-priestly king." The moral transformation of humanity and the world is the end of redemption, and every forward step of Christian world-history and of Christian culture is an approximation to this God-willed consummation. Hence the gladness wherewith Rothe welcomed every advance of true art; and hence the enthusiasm wherewith he sought to awaken the Church to a lively co-operation in all movements looking to the promotion of high social and moral culture.

The notion that Christianity is more than *mere* religion lies at the basis of Rothe's much-criticized and Hegelian-tinged view of the relation of the Church to the State. The end of the Church is, to prepare humanity for spontaneously erecting and rising into a state of objective morality. In so far as it realizes this end, it fulfills and finishes its mission, and progressively falls into the background, preparatorily to its own supersedure by something higher. When humanity is entirely renovated the mission of the Church will be ended, the *βασιλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ* will be fully established, the *ἐκκλησία* will have become a *βασιλεία*, the Church will lose itself in the State, the universal religious life will have become the normal and silent presupposition of the moral.

In this peculiar, and, as we think, erroneous notion of the ultimate passing over of the Church into the State, lies, in part, the explanation of Rothe's co-operating with the purposes of the unorthodox *Protestantenverein* in its pretended efforts at reconciling religion with modern culture, and at sacrificing Churchianity in the interest of essential Christianity. In this co-operation Rothe was not inwardly untrue to his former self. Its true secret lies in his habitual over-charitableness toward those with whom he was surrounded, and in his allowing his constitutional impressibility from without—his "femininity"—to be too strongly influenced by certain of his restless and masculinely initiative colleagues, as also in his not clearly enough keeping up the distinction (which he had so clearly and judiciously drawn in his Ethics) between Christian and non-Christian culture—between that morality whose vitalizing principle is true religion, and that mere outward morality of conduct in the unregenerate which is not rooted in the heart, but merely passively received and formally worn under the restraint of religion-created public opinion. And we have the clearest proofs that Rothe did not, in this co-operation, abate, or intend to abate, one iota of his sound and evangelical Christianity. He hoped to be able to hold fast to all the essentials of true religion, and yet to present it in such a way as that it should be more influential upon, and more acceptable to, the cultured classes of modern society. His thought was, that there are whole strata of persons in the world of to-day who are subjectively more nearly Christians than they are objectively; who have a sort of unconscious religion. To this thought Rothe gave elaborate expression in an address at a meeting of the *Verein* in Eisenach, in 1865—a paper intended to be a sort of bid to these unconscious Christians to put themselves into a closer relation to this new form of the Church.

This "bid" did not fall echoless upon the empty air. Within a few months it was elaborately and specifically answered by two admitted representatives of this fondly-hoped Christian-minded culture, the one a Pantheist and the other a Deist—answered with biting ridicule and scorn, and with an utter rejection of all overtures. Modern culture shows itself determined to make no compromise—will have nothing to do with half measures. The Church must utterly break and cast

away its scepter. Having no shred of truth in it, it must totally vanish away with the smoke of the past and give place to the sunshine of science. One of the writers sneeringly doubts whether Rothe really knows any thing about the spirit of so-called "modern culture;" the other sees in the liberal Christianity of the *Verein* the first step of the Church toward abdicating her throne; but it is only a single step, which of itself serves no good purpose. She must entirely abdicate and cast her already long-eclipsed crown at the feet of victorious science.

Such was the unfortunate movement into which a few such men as Daniel Schenkel (taking advantage of an erroneous speculative view of Rothe) tempted the over-charitable and over-unsuspecting theologian to engage during the last few years of his failing and declining life. But to all who have intimately known him in former years—to the multitudes who have sat at his feet and heard him reverently discourse of "his Lord Christ," and to all who come under the influence of the almost divine unction that rests upon his writings—there cannot be the least doubt but that the temporary vacillation of their master was simply an incident of his declining vigor. Indeed, it was clearly observed by his students, in his later years, that he not unfrequently "*blieb stecken in der Konstruction*" (lost the connection of his thoughts) when treating of difficult points. This slight obscuration, however, of his fair reputation will be of but very short duration. When the rancor of party spirit shall have allayed itself, the benign form of Richard Rothe will take its proper place in the serene company of great teachers, of whom God gives a few to the Church in every age.

To the great English-reading Christian public Dr. Rothe is destined to remain only remotely known. His writings are so peculiar in form, so utterly and crabbedly German — the thoughts are so imbedded in and identified with the expression—that they will never be successfully translated. Their wholesome influence, however, will not remain shut up in Germany, but will flow over to other nations through manifold secondary and tertiary channels. But the personal life of the author—that beautiful life of love to Christ—is a perennial flower, whose rich fragrance is now extending to all climes, and will be wafted far across the ages of the future.

away its sceptre. Having no shred of truth in it, it must totally vanish away with the smoke of the past and give place to the sunshine of science. One of the writers seemingly doubts whether Rothe really knows any thing about the spirit of so-called "moderne cultur;" the other sees in the liberal Christianity of the Future the first step of the Church toward abdicating her throne; but it is only a single step, which of itself serves no good purpose. She must entirely abdicate and cast her already long-eclipsed crown at the feet of victorious science.

Such was the unfortunate movement into which a few such men as Daniel Schenkel (taking advantage of an erroneous speculative view of Rothe) tempted the over-charitable and over-unsuspecting theologian to engage during the last few years of his failing and declining life. But to all who have intimately known him in former years—to the multitudes who have sat at his feet and heard him reverently discourse of "his Lord Christ," and to all who come under the influence of the almost divine unction that rests upon his writings—there cannot be the least doubt but that the temporary vacillation of their master was simply an incident of his declining vigor. Indeed, it was clearly observed by his students, in his later years, that he not unfrequently "*blieb stecken in der Konstruction*" (lost the connection of his thoughts) when treating of difficult points. This slight obscuration, however, of his fair reputation will be of but very short duration. When the rancor of party spirit shall have allayed itself, the benign form of Richard Rothe will take its proper place in the serene company of great teachers, of whom God gives a few to the Church in every age.

To the great English-reading Christian public Dr. Rothe is destined to remain only remotely known. His writings are so peculiar in form, so utterly and exclusively German—the thoughts are so imbedded in and identified with the expression—that they will never be successfully translated. Their wholesome influence, however, will not remain shut up in Germany, but will flow ever to other nations through manifold secondary and tertiary channels. But the personal life of the author—that beautiful life of love to Christ—is a perennial flower, whose rich fragrance is now extending to all climes, and will be wafted far across the ages of the future.

ART. III.—THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

SCIENTIFIC SCHOOLS AND SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS IN COLLEGES.

IT has not required a very close observation to notice that there have been gradually growing up among us modifications of the educational ideas of our fathers. Without attempting to trace these modifications, or to enter into an exhaustive statement of them, we may nevertheless say that they have chiefly arisen from the new and increasing claims of Natural Science, Agriculture, Civil, Topographical, and Mechanical Engineering, Architecture, etc., which have led to the formation of Departments of Natural Science and Engineering in our Colleges, Institutes of Technology, and Agricultural Colleges.

There seems to be an increasing haste on the part of young men to get into their hands the tools with which to work in their various callings, to become experts in some particular line, to the neglect of a broad and general culture. Some of this class are becoming professional scientists. Of the evils which may come to the sciences from being developed by these men of defective general culture, and other questions connected with this subject, we will not now speak. But the fact exists that special departments in colleges, and also separate schools, like the Technical schools in Boston and Worcester, seem to be now rising in favor with young men. Many have been diverted from a full collegiate course of study into these institutions; and from this fact we think that we can explain, to some extent, the recent comparative decline in the number of college students in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Our view of the New England Colleges would be defective without a presentation of this part of the subject. We have therefore prepared tables giving statistics of the Scientific Departments and Institutions of New England in 1850 and 1870:

Art. III.—THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

Scientific Schools and Scientific Departments in Colleges.

It has not required a very close observation to notice that there have been gradually growing up among us modifications of the educational ideas of our fathers. Without attempting to trace these modifications, or to enter into an exhaustive statement of them, we may nevertheless say that they have chiefly arisen from the new and increasing claims of Natural Science, Agriculture, Civil, Topographical, and Mechanical Engineering, Architecture, etc., which have led to the formation of Departments of Natural Science and Engineering in our Colleges, Institutes of Technology, and Agricultural Colleges.

There seems to be an increasing haste on the part of young men to get into their hands the tools with which to work in their various callings, to become experts in some particular line, to the neglect of a broad and general culture. Some of this class are becoming professional scientists. Of the evils which may come to the sciences from being developed by these men of defective general culture, and other questions connected with this subject, we will not now speak. But the fact exists that special departments in colleges, and also separate schools, like the Technical schools in Boston and Worcester, seem to be now rising in favor with young men. Many have been diverted from a full collegiate course of study into these institutions; and from this fact we think that we can explain, to some extent, the recent comparative decline in the number of college students in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Our view of the New England Colleges would be defective without a presentation of this part of the subject. We have therefore prepared tables giving statistics of the Scientific Departments and Institutions of New England in 1880 and 1870:

Scientific Departments and Institutions—1850.

CHARACTER OF INSTITUTION AND LOCATION.	Students.	RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS.							
		Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Island.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	*From out of* New Eng'd.
Scientific Department of Yale College	34	..	1	1	2	1	10	15	19
" " Harvard College	73	1	1	..	39	..	..	41	32
Norwich University, Vermont	60*	1	12	19	14	..	6	52	8
Total	167	2	14	20	55	1	16	108	59

* 1849–50. But few students in this institution pursue the classical course.

Scientific Colleges and Departments—1870.

CHARACTER OF INSTITUTION AND LOCATION.	Students.	RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS.							
		Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Island.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	*From out of* New Eng'd.
Institutes of Technology:									
Boston, Mass	224	4	8	2	174	2	4	194	30
Worcester, Mass	89	..	2	..	75	2	1	80	9
Total	313	4	10	2	249	4	5	274	39
Agricultural Colleges:									
Amherst, Mass	147	..	7	3	105	..	9	124	23
Orono, Me	31	31	..	..	..	..	..	31	..
Hanover, N. H.*	9	..	8	1	..	..	..	9	..
Total	187	31	15	4	105	..	9	164	23
Scientific Departments in other Colleges:									
Yale College	125	2	..	..	2	1	67	72	53
Harvard College	35	..	1	..	15	..	..	16	19
Dartmouth College	77	7	27	13	8	..	..	55	22
Brown University	26	1	1	..	2	18	1	23	3
Norwich University, Vt	54	..	1	38	8	1	..	48	6
University of Vermont,* Burlington, Vt	20	..	..	15	1	..	..	16	4
Total	337	10	30	66	36	20	68	230	107
Aggregate	837	45	55	72	390	24	82	668	169

* Partly scientific and partly agricultural, but partaking more of the character of the former than the latter.

NOTE.—Six of the above institutions have been endowed by Congress by gifts of public lands amounting to 1,170,000 "acres in scrip," namely: Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College, 180,000 acres; Maine Agricultural College, 210,000 acres; Massachusetts Agricultural College at Amherst, 360,000 acres; New Hampshire Agricultural College at Hanover, 150,000 acres; Scientific School of Brown University, 150,000 acres; Vermont Agricultural College, 150,000 acres.

From the foregoing tables we see that in 1850 there were 167 students in the Scientific Departments of our New England Colleges and in the Norwich University, of whom 108 were from New England.

In 1870 there were 837 in all these Departments and Institutions, of whom 668 were from New England; 337 of these were in the Scientific Departments of Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, Brown, Norwich University, and the University of Vermont; 187 were in the three Agricultural Colleges of Mas-

sachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine, and 313 were in the two Technical Schools of Boston and Worcester. This is an increase of nearly four hundred per cent. in twenty years in students of this class.

It may not be amiss, and it may aid our conceptions of what is actually being done in the higher departments of learning, to combine the results of the two tables of scientific students for 1850 and 1870 with those of the Colleges for 1850 and 1870, as follows:

Scientific and Collegiate Students—1850.

Character of Students.	Students.	Residence of Students.							
		Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Island.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From out of New Eng'd.
Scientific Students	167	2	14	20	55	1	16	108	59
Collegiate Students	2,054	187	176	211	604	64	191	1,433	621
Total	2,221	189	190	231	659	65	207	1,541	680

1870.

Character of Students.	Students.	Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Island.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From out of New Eng'd.
Scientific Students	837	45	55	72	390	24	82	668	169
Collegiate Students	2,753	290	174	190	808	108	231	1,801	952
Total	3,590	335	229	262	1,198	132	313	2,469	1,121

Calculating on the basis of these tables, we find that the aspect of the field is somewhat changed. In 1850 there was in New England one student for 1,725 inhabitants, and in 1870 one for 1,490 inhabitants, which indicates a slight decline from 1830 to 1850, (as previously given,) but a good gain since 1850.

Maine had,	in 1830,	one student for	3,195	inhabitants.
"	" 1850,	"	3,118	"
"	" 1870,	"	1,871	"
New Hampshire,	" 1830,	"	2,000	"
"	" 1850,	"	1,807	"
"	" 1870,	"	1,453	"
Vermont,	" 1830,	"	2,210	"
"	" 1850,	"	1,360	"
"	" 1870,	"	1,266	"
Massachusetts,	" 1830,	"	1,153	"
"	" 1850,	"	1,509	"
"	" 1870,	"	1,214	"
Rhode Island,	" 1830,	"	2,805	"
"	" 1850,	"	2,305	"
"	" 1870,	"	1,672	"

Connecticut had, in 1830, one student for 1,503 inhabitants.
" " 1850, " 1,308 "
" " 1870, " 1,722 "

By this method of reckoning the case is much improved in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island, showing a greater gain upon the population in each State. Massachusetts has retrieved some of her loss from 1830 to 1850, but is still behind where she stood in 1830, and Connecticut is also far below where she stood in 1830.

But there are strong reasons why these two classes of students ought not to be combined in this calculation. The latter class, taken as a whole, and even a majority of them, do not hold the same rank with the former. They are all pursuing a course of study which is much more limited in its scope and power of culture, and the qualifications for admission to them are also far inferior. The conclusion, then, is inevitable, that there is not as large an average amount of collegiate training in the population of New England as there was in 1830 or in 1850.

How far this decline in collegiate culture may be accounted for from the general advancement made in the course of study pursued in our common schools, in their present graded form, under which our high schools are now imparting instruction nearly equivalent to the first two years of the college courses forty years ago, is worthy of being considered in this connection, but we will not now enter into it.

THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES

is also an important topic, and of great interest in many minds. We have space only for the insertion of some valuable statistics, without comment, furnishing data for remark and discussion elsewhere. We are in debt to the Society of Religious Inquiry at Andover, Mass., for these statistics. We have selected those for New England.

In 1855, of 1,485 students in nine New England Colleges, 678, or forty-five per cent., were professors of religion. In 1865, of 2,203 students in twelve New England Colleges, 1,065, or forty-eight per cent., were professors of religion. But in the nine Colleges reckoned in 1855, Harvard, Yale, and Bates were not included, the statistics not having been obtained. In order to make a proper comparison between the same colleges, By this method of reckoning the case is much improved in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island, showing a greater gain upon the population in each State. Massachusetts has retrieved some of her loss from 1830 to 1850, but is still behind where she stood in 1838, and Connecticut is also far below where she stood in 1830.

But there are strong reasons why these two classes of students ought not to be considered in this calculation. The latter class, taken as a whole, and even a majority of them, do not hold the same rank with the former. They are all pursuing a course of study which is much more limited in its scope and power of culture, and the qualifications for admission to them are also far inferior. The conclusion, then, is inevitable, that there is not as large an average amount of collegiate training in the population of New England as there was in 1830 or in 1838.

How far this decline in collegiate culture may be accounted for from the general advancement made in the course of study pursued in our common schools, in their present graded form, under which our high schools are now imparting instruction nearly equivalent to the first two years of the college course forty years ago, is worthy of being considered in this connection, but we will not now enter into it.

THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES is also an important topic, and of great interest to many minds. We have space only for the insertion of some valuable statistics, without comment, furnishing data for remark and discussion elsewhere. We are in debt to the Society of Religious Inquiry at Andover, Mass., for these statistics. We have selected those for New England.

In 1855, of 1,488 students in nine New England Colleges, 673, or forty-five per cent., were professors of religion. In 1868, of 2,908 students in twelve New England Colleges, 1,395, or forty-eight per cent., were professors of religion. But in the nine Colleges reckoned in 1855, Harvard, Yale, and Bates were not included, the statistics not having been obtained. In order to make a proper comparison between the same colleges, therefore, these ought to be omitted from the calculation for 1865. Doing this, we have 730 professors of religion out of 1,236 students in 1865, or fifty-nine per cent., which is an increase of fifteen per cent. in the number of professors of religion, in ten years, in the same colleges.

THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS.

The Theological Schools in New England constitute another important field of investigation. It is desirable to know what prospects are indicated by the statistical exhibits of these institutions as to the future supply of our ministerial ranks. It is a well known fact that these schools in New England have heretofore supplied a large number of learned ministers to the Church, and that her confidence in them has steadily increased.

The establishment of Andover Theological Seminary, by the Congregationalists, as a means of training young men for the ministry who should be untainted by the then rising heresy of Unitarianism, was soon followed by the founding of other similar schools at Bangor, New Haven, and East Windsor, and others, by other denominations. Their number in 1830 was six; in 1850, eleven; and in 1870, twelve. These tables have been prepared to afford exhibits of these institutes, their students, and the residence of the students in 1830, in 1850, and in 1870.

Theological Schools in New England—1830.

DENOMINATION AND LOCATION.	Students.	RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS.							
		Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Isl'd.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From out of New Eng'd.
Evangelical Schools—									
Congregational: Andover, Mass.	138	10	27	17	56	..	12	122	16
Bangor, Me.	14	..	..	3	4	..	7	14	..
New Haven, Conn.	49	..	..	8	9	..	31	43	6
Baptist:									
Newton, Mass.	21	..	3	2	7	1	3	16	5
Free-will Baptist:									
New Hampton, N. H.	6	..	2	1	3	..	..	6	..
Unevangelical Schools—									
Unitarian: Cambridge, Mass.	42	2	1	1	36	1	..	41	1
Total Congregational Students	201	10	27	23	69	..	50	179	22
Total other Evangelical Students	27	..	5	3	10	1	3	22	5
Total Evangelical	228	10	32	26	79	1	53	201	27
Total Unevangelical	42	2	1	1	36	1	..	41	1
Aggregate	270	12	33	27	115	2	53	242	28

Theological Seminaries in New England—1850.

DENOMINATION, NAME, AND LOCATION.	Students.	Residence of Students. Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Isl'd.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From out of New Eng'd.
Evangelical Schools—Congregational:									
Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass..	90	4	15	11	34	..	4	68	22
Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.....	35	24	4	2	5	..	..	35	..
Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.......	38	..	3	1	8	..	16	28	10
Theological Inst. of Conn., Hartford, Conn......	26	1	2	2	11	..	7	23	3
Gilmanton Theological School, Gilmanton, N. H..	23*	4	10	7	2	..	..	23	..
Baptist:									
Newton Theological Institution, Newton, Mass.	36	8	1	1	8	8	..	21	15
Theological School of Fairfax Sem., Fairfax, Vt.*	26	2	3	9	9	..	..	23	3
Methodist:									
General Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H......	59†	4	8	7	7	..	5	31	28
Episcopal:									
Berkley Divinity School, ‡ Hartford, Conn.....	18	..	..	..	1	..	4	5	13
Free-will Baptist:									
New Hampton Theol. Inst., § N. Hamp., N. H.	26	3	6	1	2	..	1	13	13
Unevangelical Schools—Unitarian:									
Cambridge Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass...	23	1	4	..	14	..	..	19	4
Total Congregational Students....................	212	33	34	23	60	..	27	177	35
Total Baptist Students..............................	62	10	4	10	17	3	..	44	18
Total other Evangelical Students..................	103	7	14	8	10	..	10	49	54
Total Evangelical....................................	377	50	52	41	87	3	37	270	107
Total Unevangelical..................................	23	1	4	..	14	..	..	19	4
Aggregate..	400	51	56	41	101	3	37	289	111

* For 1849; these schools have since been disbanded. † For 1852. ‡ Since removed to Middletown, Conn. § Recently removed to Bates' College, Lewiston, Me.

Theological Seminaries in New England—1870.

When Founded.	DENOMINATION, NAME, AND LOCATION.	Students.	Residence of Students. Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Isl'd.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From out of New Eng'd.
	Evangelical Schools—Congregational:									
1808	Andover Theological Sem., Andover, Mass...	88	5	5	8	27	3	4	47	41
1816	Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me...	31	13	3	1	6	..	1	24	7
1822	Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.....	55	1	1	1	5	..	15	23	32
1834	Theological Inst. of Conn., Hartford, Conn..	28	..	1	..	13	..	9	23	5
	Episcopal:									
1847	Berkley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.*	28	..	..	..	1	1	18	20	8
1867	Episcopal Theol. School, Cambridge, Mass...	12	1	..	..	8	..	..	9	3
..	Theological Class, (Private,) Burlington, Vt.†	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Baptist:									
1826	Newton Theological Institute, Newton, Mass.	50	11	2	6	11	1	4	35	15
	Methodist:									
1847	Boston Theological Seminary,‡ Boston, Mass.	81	7	7	8	20	1	3	41	40
	Free-will Baptist:									
1829	Theol. School of Bates' Col., § Lewiston, Me.	25	15	4	1	..	..	..	20	5
	Unevangelical Schools—Unitarian:									
1814	Cambridge Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.	37	3	1	..	19	1	2	26	11
	Universalist:									
1865	Tufts' College Divinity School, Medford, Mass..	12	..	..	..	8	1	1	10	2
	Swedenborgian:									
1867	Theological Institution, Waltham, Mass......	4	..	..	..	4	..	..	4	..
....	Total Congregational Students..................	202	19	10	5	51	3	29	117	85
....	Total Episcopal Students.........................	40	1	..	..	9	1	18	29	11
....	Total other Evangelical Students................	156	33	13	10	31	2	7	96	60
....	Total Evangelical..................................	398	53	23	15	91	6	54	242	156
....	Total Unevangelical................................	53	3	1	..	31	2	3	40	13
....	Aggregate..	451	56	24	15	122	8	57	282	169

* Removed from Hartford in 1855. † Only three or four students. ‡ Removed from Concord, N. H., in 1867. § Removed from New Hampton, N. H., 1870.

An examination of the foregoing tables will reveal some very important facts for the Churches to consider.

Taking the whole number, the evangelical and unevangelical, from New England and from out of New England, and we find,

In 1830, 270 students.
In 1850, 400 students; increase, 130.
In 1870, 451 students; increase, 51.

The number from *out of* New England, considered separately, is as follows:

In 1830, 28 students.
In 1850, 111 students; increase, 83.
In 1870, 169 students; increase, 58.

By comparing, we shall see that this increase from out of New England was seven more than the whole increase in the students in these seminaries from 1850 to 1870.

Taking next the theological students who were from New England, and we find different results. The Congregationalists had,

In 1830, 179 students.
In 1850, 177 students; decrease, 2.
In 1870, 117 students; decrease, 60.

Gilmanton Theological Seminary has been disbanded since 1850; and yet Andover Theological Seminary had, in 1830, 122 students from New England; in 1850, 68 students; and, in 1870, 47 students from the same territory, a very serious decline. But Andover is not very far distant from Gilmanton, and should have increased after that institution became defunct. The Baptists in New England had,

In 1830, 16 theological students.
In 1850, 44 theological students; increase, 28.
In 1870, 35 theological students; decrease, 9.

The Episcopalians in New England had,

In 1850, 5 theological students.
In 1870, 29 theological students; increase, 24.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in New England had,

In 1850, 31 theological students.
In 1870, 41 theological students; increase, 10.

This small increase of students in theological schools, and, in some instances, an actual decrease, is not owing to any de-

cline in the number of communicants in these denominations, for they have all had a very healthy increase, as will be seen from the following statistics of communicants:

· The Congregationalists in New England, in 1850, had 156,118 communicants; in 1870, 191,241: increase, 355,123.

The Baptists in New England, in 1850, had 90,911 communicants; in 1870, 105,412: increase, 14,501.

The Methodists in New England, in 1850, had 84,007 communicants; in 1870, 117,098: increase, 33,091.

The Episcopalians in New England, in 1850, had 19,806 communicants; in 1870, 37,289: increase, 17,483.

In these four denominations in New England there was a total increase of 100,198 communicants during the last twenty years. During the same period the theological students of these four denominations decreased thirty-five. These figures show the startling fact that these four leading denominations in New England, in 1850, had one theological student to 1,361 communicants; in 1870, one to 2,031.

In 1870 it took fifty per cent. more communicants to furnish one theological student than in 1850. I have not space for comments upon this fact. I only bring it out, as a legitimate deduction, that it may be duly pondered and discussed by others.

It is unnecessary to make a comparison with the population. I will only add that the case looks worse by such a comparison. It seems proper next to analyze the tables and find where the falling-off has been:

Maine, in 1830, had 10 theological students in Evangelical institutions; in 1850, 50; and in 1870, 53.

New Hampshire, in 1830, had 32; in 1850, 52; and in 1870, 23.

Vermont, in 1830, had 26; in 1850, 41; in 1870, 15.

Massachusetts, in 1830, had 79; in 1850, 87; and in 1870, 91.

Rhode Island, in 1830, had 1; in 1850, 3; and in 1870, 6.

Connecticut, in 1830, had 53; in 1850, 37; and in 1870, 54.

In 1870 New Hampshire furnished 29 students less than in 1850, and Vermont 26 less. Maine gained three students

since 1850. Massachusetts had four more than in 1850, though only twelve more than in 1830. Rhode Island gained five since 1830, and Connecticut 17 since 1850, although in 1870 she had only one more than in 1830.

There is another important fact which has a bearing upon the subject of the prospective supply of the ministry.

The Societies of Religious Inquiry at Andover and Chicago have developed some valuable statistics in regard to the future professional intentions of young men in our colleges. I will cite two items.

In 1855, of the 1,485 students in nine New England colleges, 374, or twenty-five per cent., had the Christian ministry in view.

In 1865, of the 1,588 students in ten New England colleges, 257, or sixteen per cent., intended to become ministers of the Gospel.

It is well known that only a small portion of those who enter the Christian ministry pass through the theological schools. It is impossible to obtain exact data in regard to this class; but we have some valuable facts which cover a part of this ground, and which are sufficiently exact and clear to indicate a growing tendency among the graduates of colleges.

In November, 1870, Rev. Christopher Cushing, D.D., of Boston, in an address delivered at the laying of the corner-stone of the College Church, at Amherst, Mass., brought out some interesting facts bearing upon this question. Taking the eight colleges in New England founded by the Congregationalists—Amherst, Bowdoin, Harvard, Dartmouth, Middlebury, the University of Vermont, Williams, and Yale—and setting aside the alumni of the last five years, in order to allow time for those so desiring to have entered the ministry, he then gave, in decades, the graduates for the previous fifty years. From 1815 to 1865 these colleges furnished 16,242 graduates, of whom 4,100, or about twenty-five per cent., became ministers.

Dividing the fifty years into decades, the proportion of graduates who became ministers was as follows:

First decade, thirty per cent.; second decade, thirty-five per cent.; third decade, twenty-seven per cent.; fourth decade, twenty per cent.; fifth decade, eighteen per cent.

The different colleges have furnished ministers relative to their alumni:

Amherst, forty-six per cent.; Middlebury, forty-two per cent.; Williams, thirty-three per cent.; Yale, twenty-four per cent.; University of Vermont, twenty-four per cent.; Bowdoin, twenty-one per cent.; Harvard, eleven per cent.

The actual number from these colleges who became ministers, in the successive decades, was as follows:

First decade, 688; second decade, 988; third decade, 946; fourth decade, 730; fifth decade, 750.

Now, when we consider the fact that while the number of graduates from these colleges in the last decade was nearly double that of the first, at the same time the number of ministers in the last was but little in advance of that of the first, although the demand for ministers is greatly increased, these figures seem to demonstrate that the number of young men entering the ministry from collegiate life is diminishing, and, considered in connection with the facts deduced from the statistics of the theological seminaries, they suggest topics for serious inquiry. Whatever may be the prospects of an educated ministry in other portions of the country, in New England it is by no means flattering.

NEW ENGLAND METHODIST ACADEMIES.

It is impossible to obtain the statistics of all the academies* in New England, but those under the control of the Methodist Episcopal Church are well known to us.

The Conference Seminaries, therefore, demand our attention, that we may ascertain whether any thing is indicated by their statistical condition, which needs to be seriously considered, or which may suggest any new line of policy in regard to them.

For this purpose several tables have been prepared from the most reliable data that can be obtained, covering the periods of 1830, 1840, 1850, and 1870, as follows:

---

* In 1830 there were 163 incorporated Academies in New England, of which 56 were in Massachusetts, 27 in Connecticut, 20 in Vermont, 30 in New Hampshire, and 30 in Maine. Besides these there were numerous unincorporated academies and select schools.

New England Methodist Seminaries—1830 and 1840.

When Founded.	Name and Location.	Students. 1830.	Students. 1840.
1818	Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, Mass.....................	*222	361
1821	Maine Wesleyan Seminary, Kent's Hill, Me................	120	313
1833	Newbury Seminary, Newbury, Vt..........................	...	425
1837	Poultney Academy, Poultney, Vt..........................	...	286
	Total...	342	1,385

* For 1832.

New England Methodist Seminaries—1850.

When Founded.	Name and Location.	Students.	Residence of Students. Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Isl'd.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From *out of* New Eng'd.
1818	Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, Mass.........	*373	2	3	2	264	5	74	350	23
1821	Maine Wesleyan Seminary, Kent's Hill, Me....	245	235	4	..	5	..	..	244	1
1833	Vermont Conference Seminary, Newbury, Vt..	479	2	142	299	13	..	4	460	19
1839	Providence Conf. Seminary, E. Greenwich, R. I.	185	..	..	3	47	106	22	178	7
1845	N. Hampshire Conf. Seminary, Tilton, N. H...	400	4	355	5	31	..	1	396	4
1850	East Maine Conference Sem., Bucksport, Me....	†294	291	..	..	..	..	..	291	3
1837	Troy Conference Seminary, Poultney, Vt.......	359	..	..	151	2	..	2	155	204
1846	Springfield Wesleyan Seminary, Springfield, Vt.	‡261	2	5	252	2	..	..	261	..
	Total................................	2,596	536	509	712	364	111	103	2,335	261

* The number of students this year was less than before or after. In 1849 it was 540. In 1851 it was 6?9. † For the year 1854. ‡ For the year 1847.

NOTE.—In the number of students in all these tables is embraced the whole number of different students during the year.

New England Methodist Seminaries—1870.

When Founded.	Name and Location.	Students.	Residence of Students. Maine.	N. Hamp.	Vermont.	Mass.	Rhode Isl'd.	Conn.	From New Eng'd.	From *out of* New Eng'd.
1818	Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, Mass........	593	5	6	8	285	3	184	491	102
1821	Maine Wesleyan Seminary, Kent's Hill, Me....	347	324	2	..	13	..	..	339	8
1833	Vermont Conference Seminary, Montpelier, Vt..	360	..	27	318	8	..	1	354	6
1839	Providence Conf. Seminary, E. Greenwich, R. I.	197	..	..	..	36	106	32	174	23
1845	N. Hampshire Conf. Seminary, Tilton, N. H...	318	1	285	2	25	..	..	313	5
1850	East Maine Conference Sem., Bucksport, Me....	255	245	1	..	1	..	..	247	8
	Total................................	2,070	575	821	328	368	109	217	1,918	152

We ascertain from the foregoing tables that the number of students in these institutions has been, in 1830, 342; in 1840, 1,385; in 1850, 2,596; in 1870, 2,070.

Here is a decrease of 526 during the last twenty years. This may be explained in part by the fact that the Springfield Wesleyan Seminary, Vermont, and the Poultney Academy, are now no longer Conference institutions. Undoubtedly the territory formerly patronizing these institutions now patronize the institution of Dr. King, at Fort Edward, N. Y., and others are

numbered in Dr. Newman's Boys' School at Poultney. Still the fact remains that there are not as many students in the Methodist seminaries in New England as there were twenty years ago, by 526.

But, deducting the 620 students connected with the Springfield and Poultney Institutions in 1850, and we have left 1,976 in the same seminaries which now exist, which will enable us to judge of their comparative progress. In doing so, we find that the present Conference academies in New England have increased only 94 students since 1850.

But taking the fact just discovered, let us analyze the case more closely, and ascertain clearer and more distinct ideas of the situation. The Wilbraham Academy has increased from 373 to 593, although the number of students in 1850 was about 100 less than the average for several years about that time. The Maine Wesleyan Seminary increased from 245 to 347 students. The Vermont Conference Seminary, now at Montpelier, decreased from 479 to 360 students. .The Providence Conference Seminary increased 12 students. The New Hampshire Conference Seminary decreased from 400 to 318 students. The East Maine Conference Seminary decreased from 261 to 255 students. The Vermont Conference Seminary, the East Maine Conference Seminary, and the New Hampshire Conference Seminary, have decreased.

Reviewing the tables by States, we find that in 1870 Maine furnished 39 more students than in 1850, New Hampshire 188 less, Vermont (the Poultney and Springfield Seminaries, in 1850, being deducted) 18 less, Massachusetts 4 more, Rhode Island 3 less, and Connecticut 114 more. Massachusetts and Rhode Island have only about kept their number where it was in 1850, notwithstanding the increase of their population has been about forty-six per cent. The other States, except Connecticut, have declined.

Judging, then, from the past twenty years, the prospects of our Conference seminaries, as a whole, are not very flattering. During this period, in which there has been an increase of only 84 students in our six Conference seminaries, there has been an increase of 33,000 in Methodist communicants in New England, and a very great advance in influence, wealth, and general culture. Whence, then, this comparative decline of numbered in Dr. Newman's Boys' School at Poultney. Still the fact remains that there are not as many students in the Methodist seminaries in New England as there were twenty years ago, by 528.

But, deducting the 620 students connected with the Springfield and Poultney Institutions in 1850, and we have left 1,270 in the same seminaries which now exist, which will enable us to judge of their comparative progress. In doing so, we find that the present Conference academies in New England have increased only 94 students since 1850.

But taking the fact just discovered, let us analyze the case more closely, and ascertain clearer and more distinct ideas of the situation. The Wilbraham Academy has increased from 378 to 693, although the number of students in 1850 was about 100 less than the average for several years about that time. The Maine Wesleyan Seminary increased from 245 to 347 students. The Vermont Conference Seminary, now at Montpelier, decreased from 479 to 350 students. The Providence Conference Seminary increased 12 students. The New Hampshire Conference Seminary decreased from 400 to 318 students. The East Maine Conference Seminary decreased from 361 to 255 students. The Vermont Conference Seminary, the East Maine Conference Seminary, and the New Hampshire Conference Seminary, have decreased.

Reviewing the tables by States, we find that in 1870 Maine furnished 89 more students than in 1850, New Hampshire 143 less, Vermont (the Poultney and Springfield Seminaries in 1850, being deducted) 13 less, Massachusetts 4 more, Rhode Island 8 less, and Connecticut 114 more. Massachusetts and Rhode Island have only about kept their number where it was in 1850, notwithstanding the increase of their population has been about forty-six per cent. The other States, except Connecticut, have declined.

Judging, then, from the past twenty years, the prospects of our Conference seminaries, as a whole, are not very flattering. During this period, in which there has been an increase of only 94 students in our six Conference seminaries, there has been an increase of 33,000 in Methodist communicants in New England, and a very great advance in influence, wealth, and general culture. Whence, then, this comparative decline of these institutions? It would seem that it could not be accounted for from the circumstances or the tastes of our people.

Whence, then, the difference? We think that it is to be attributed to new circumstances which have arisen, and to new educational means. We refer to high schools in all the larger towns and cities, to normal schools, to business colleges, and commercial schools.

We have accurate data in regard to high schools in Massachusetts. In 1837 there were only 10 high schools in Massachusetts; in 1848 only 12; but in 1866 there were 120; and in 1870 there were 172. These schools are not so numerous in the other New England States. Connecticut has never, as a State, adopted the system of requiring high schools to be supported by towns. But there is a law permitting them to be established and maintained either by towns or districts. But only a few towns have done so. A letter from Hon. B. G. Northrop, Secretary of the Board of Education of Connecticut, gives the following statistics: high schools supported by towns, 8; high schools supported by districts, 18—total, 26. Incorporated academies, 16; not specially incorporated, 14—total academies, 30. He mentions thirteen of the more prominent select schools, and says "there are scores besides." It would seem, therefore, that the high school system has not interfered very much with academies in Connecticut. Hon. Warren Johnson, Secretary of the Board of Education in Maine, writes, "It is very evident that the high schools are reducing the academies in this State," although his statistics are not yet complete.

Maine has two normal schools; Vermont, three; Massachusetts, four; Rhode Island, one; Connecticut, one; eleven in all, besides city training schools, in large places like Boston, Providence, and Worcester. These have all been established since 1839, and seven of them since 1850.

The effect of these high schools and normal schools upon academies and select schools in Massachusetts has been very perceptible. In 1837 there were 804 incorporated and unincorporated academies, private and select schools, in Massachusetts. In 1855 there were 740; in 1867 there were 648; in 1870 there were 513, being a decrease since 1837 of 341 academies and select schools.

The number of pupils in these schools was, in 1837, 27,266;

these institutions? It would seem that it could not be accounted for from the circumstances or the tastes of our people.

Whence, then, the difference? We think that it is to be attributed to new circumstances which have arisen, and to new educational means. We refer to high schools in all the larger towns and cities, to normal schools, to business colleges, and commercial schools.

We have accurate data in regard to high schools in Massachusetts. In 1837 there were only 10 high schools in Massachusetts; in 1848 only 32; but in 1866 there were 120; and in 1870 there were 172. These schools are not so numerous in the other New England States. Connecticut has never, as a State, adopted the system of requiring high schools to be supported by towns. But there is a law permitting them to be established and maintained either by towns or districts. But only a few towns have done so. A letter from Hon. B. G. Northrop, Secretary of the Board of Education of Connecticut, gives the following statistics: high schools supported by towns, 8; high schools supported by districts, 18—total, 26. Incorporated academies, 10; not specially incorporated, 14—total academies, 24. He mentions thirteen of the more prominent select schools, and says "there are some besides." It would seem, therefore, that the high school system has not interfered very much with academies in Connecticut. Hon. Warren Johnson, Secretary of the Board of Education in Maine, writes, "It is very evident that the high schools are excluding the academies in this state," although his statistics are not yet complete.

Maine has two normal schools; Vermont, three; Massachusetts, four; Rhode Island, one; Connecticut, one; eleven in all, besides city training schools, in large places like Boston, Providence, and Worcester. These have all been established since 1839, and seven of them since 1860.

The effect of these high schools and normal schools upon academies and select schools in Massachusetts has been very perceptible. In 1837 there were 804 incorporated and unincorporated academies, private and select schools in Massachusetts. In 1856 there were 740; in 1867 there were 646; in 1870 there were 513, being a decrease since 1837 of 291 academies and select schools.

The number of pupils in these schools was, in 1837, 27,266;

in 1855, 21,464; in 1867, 19,951; in 1870, 16,807; or 10,359 less scholars than in 1837.*

The amount paid for tuition in these schools was, in 1837, $328,026 75; in 1855, $329,623 62; in 1867, 345,262 49; in 1870, 591,548 29, being an increase of $262,421 44. In 1870 it cost eighty per cent. more to educate sixty-two per cent. less pupils in the academies and select schools of Massachusetts than in 1837. In 1837 the average tuition was $12; in 1870 the average tuition was $35.

Besides these, the Catholics have nine academies, eight convents, and twenty parish schools, with about seven thousand pupils in Massachusetts.

But, notwithstanding the high schools and normal schools have been diminishing the number of the academies and select schools, yet the academies can never be wholly superseded by them, for two reasons:

1. There will always be numerous communities where the high schools can never be maintained. The Statutes of Massachusetts require that a high school shall be established in towns where there are five hundred families, or about two thousand five hundred inhabitants. And it cannot be successfully maintained in a smaller population. But the great majority of the towns of New England have less than that number, and academies will always be needed to collect and educate the rising youth of these towns.

2. The course of study in the high school will not suit the wants of all minds. It is a part of a graded system on a set plan. Many either cannot afford the time to pursue such a course, or they do not find in that plan the particular studies which they wish to pursue; especially young men and young ladies who have a special calling in view, but whose early education has been neglected. The academy and select school afford the best opportunities to such persons.

Hence, academies will always be a necessity. Let us, therefore, as a denomination, have our share of them and maintain them well. Hitherto these Conference academies have been greatly blessed to the good of our Zion.

---

* Of the 513 academies and select schools reported in 1870, 47 were incorporated, with 2,891 students. In 1854 there were 66 incorporated academies with 4,142 students.

And yet a strictly denominational or parish system of education can never supply all localities, and cannot be carried out universally in this country. The Old School Presbyterians undertook to introduce such a system twenty-five years ago, but it failed, because it was contrary to popular convictions in regard to the common school system.

The results of our investigations may be summed up in three points:

1. The college system in New England, but more especially in Massachusetts and Connecticut, has relatively declined during the last forty years, and even during the last twenty years. The popular demand for the regular collegiate training has decreased, and the real wants of the public have consequently increased. What shall be done in this emergency? Shall the number of technical schools and scientific departments in our colleges be increased? Or shall a larger number of studies in our colleges be made elective? Or shall our educators retain the old course substantially as it has been, as essential to the broadest general culture, and wait for the present tendency to re-act in its favor? Or shall new institutions be established in unoccupied centers, and with new attractions and advantages? These questions are being pondered, and must be decided.

2. The number of young men fitting for the Christian ministry in our theological seminaries has been steadily declining. Why is it? Is it owing to more worldly conceptions of life, or to inadequate salaries, or to the absence of strong convictions, as an element of the piety of the present time, or a diminished faith in special theological training, or to what cause? What can be done to increase the number?

3. Our Conference seminaries must be cherished and patronized more extensively by our people, and at the same time we must foster the common schools. Neither should be allowed to suffer, for they mutually supplement each other.

ART. IV.—CONSERVATION, CORRELATION, AND ORIGIN OF THE PHYSICAL, VITAL, AND MENTAL FORCES.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

Force and Matter. Empirico-Philosophical Studies, Intelligibly Rendered, with an Additional Introduction expressly written for the English Edition. By Dr. LOUIS BUCHNER. Edited from the last edition of "Kraft und Stoff." By J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD, F.R.L.S., F.R.S., etc. Pp. 271. London: Trübner & Co. 1870.

Les Phénomènes Physique de la Vie. Par J. GAVARRET, Professeur de Physique a la Faculté de Médecine de Paris. Pp. 424. Paris: Victor Masson et fils. 1869.

Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews. By THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. Pp. 378. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

The Correlation and Conservation of Forces. A Series of Expositions. By Prof. GROVE, Prof. HELMHOLTZ, Dr. MAYER, Dr. FARADAY, Prof. LIEBIG, and Dr. CARPENTER. With an Introduction, and brief Biographical Notices of the Chief Promoters of the New Views. By EDWARD L. YOUMANS, M.D. Pp. 438. New York: Appleton & Co. 1865.

Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. New York: Appleton & Co. 1863.

Fragments of Science. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D., F.R.S. New York: Appleton & Co. 1871.

Protoplasm; or, Life, Matter, and Mind. By LIONEL S. BEALE, M.B., F.R.S. 1870.

The Mystery of Life. By LIONEL S. BEALE, M.B., F.R.S., etc.

The Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces. By GEORGE F. BARKER, M.D., Yale College. New Haven: Chatfield & Co. 1870.

Body and Mind. By HENRY MAUDSLEY, M.D., London. New York: Appleton & Co. 1871.

As Regards Protoplasm, etc. By JAMES HUTCHINSON STIRLING, LL.D., F.R.S. Edinburgh. Pp. 69. New Haven: Chatfield & Co. 1870.

Habit and Intelligence, in their Connection with the Laws of Matter and Force. By JOHN J. MURPHY. London: Macmillan & Co. 1869.

First Principles. By HERBERT SPENCER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

Principles of Biology. By HERBERT SPENCER. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

Psychology. By HERBERT SPENCER. 2 vols., (vol. i.) New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

WE have already surveyed our problem from one chemical stand-point. We now survey it from another. It is set forth in the following passage from Professor Barker's lecture: "In the early days of chemistry . . . it was supposed that the complicated *molecules of life* were beyond the reach of simple chemical law. But as more and more complex molecules have one after another been produced, chemistry has become re-assured, and now doubts not her ability to *produce them all.*" Page 15. There is a very general conviction in the minds of physicists that something like what this passage expresses is about to be accomplished. It behooves us to examine and see

ART. IV.—CONSERVATION, CORRELATION, AND ORIGIN OF THE PHYSICAL, VITAL, AND MENTAL FORCES.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

Force and Matter. Empirico-Philosophical Studies, Intelligibly Rendered. With an Additional Introduction expressly written for the English Edition. By Dr. LOUIS BÜCHNER. Edited from the last edition of "Kraft und Stoff." By J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD, F.R.S.L., F.R.G.S., etc. Pp. 271. London: Trübner & Co. 1864.

Les Phénomènes Physiques de la Vie. Par J. GAVARRET, Professeur de Physique à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris. Pp. 184. Paris: Victor Masson et fils. 1869.

Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews. By THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. Pp. 378. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

The Correlation and Conservation of Forces. A Series of Expositions. By Prof. GROVE, Prof. HELMHOLTZ, Dr. MAYER, Dr. FARADAY, Prof. LIEBIG and Dr. CARPENTER. With an Introduction, and brief Biographical Notices of the Chief Promoters of the New Views. By EDWARD L. YOUMANS, M.D. Pp. 438. New York: Appleton & Co. 1865.

Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. New York: Appleton & Co. 1863.

Fragments of Science. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D., F.R.S. New York: Appleton & Co. 1872.

Protoplasm; or, Life, Matter and Mind. By LIONEL S. BEALE, M.B., F.R.S. 1870.

The Mystery of Life. By LIONEL S. BEALE, M.D., F.R.S., etc.

The Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces. By GEORGE F. BARKER, M.D., Yale College. New Haven: Chatfield & Co. 1870.

Body and Mind. By HENRY MAUDSLEY, M.D., London. New York: Appleton & Co. 1874.

As Regards Protoplasm, etc. By JAMES HUTCHINSON STIRLING, LL.D., F.R.S. Edinburgh. Pp. 68. New Haven: Chatfield & Co. 1870.

Habit and Intelligence, in their Connection with the Laws of Matter and Force. By JOSEPH J. MURPHY. London: Macmillan & Co. 1869.

First Principles. By HERBERT SPENCER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1868.

Principles of Biology. By HERBERT SPENCER. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

Psychology. By HERBERT SPENCER. 2 vols. (vol. I.) New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

WE have already surveyed our problem from one chemical standpoint. We now survey it from another. It is set forth in the following passage from Professor Barker's lecture: "In the early days of chemistry . . . , it was supposed that the complicated *molecules of life* were beyond the reach of simple chemical law. But as more and more complex molecules have one after another been produced, chemistry has become reassured, and now doubts not her ability to produce them all." Page 15. There is a very general conviction in the minds of physicists that something like what this passage expresses is about to be accomplished. It behooves us to examine and see what it is chemistry really expects to do, and what are the grounds for the expectation. As regards the first point, it should be remembered it is "organized," not simply "organic," matter we require, and whether organic or organized, it must be *living*, not *dead.* Even this does not rise to the full height of our legitimate demand. It is not enough to furnish us with a bit of organized living matter. We really want a living organism. Any thing that falls below the requirements of these demands has but little interest for us in the present case.

Professor Barker may make all the merely organic matter he pleases; but unless he shall favor us with at least one small portion of living organic matter, but little real advancement will have been made.

Dr. Maudsley says, (*Body and Mind*, Introduction,) "Exact experiment can alone put an end to this dispute; the one conclusive experiment, indeed, in proof of the origin of living from dead matter, will be to make life." Has this ever been performed by any one?

Professor Huxley, in his address at Liverpool in 1870, as President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, says: "I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call 'vital,' may not some day be artificially brought together. All I feel justified in affirming is, that I see no reason for believing that the feat has yet been done."—*Lay Sermons*, p. 366. But "Chemistry doubts not her ability to make them all." For many, this extreme expectation is as good as the reality. It amounts to pretty much the same thing to have some confident professor predict it "will be so some day," as to be able to say "it is so." We protest, however, against this extravagant use of future possible resources. In this paragraph we are dealing not so much with the *elements*, as with the *forces* at the disposal of the chemist. They are physical, chemical, and mechanical. At this point let us hear from the calm and tolerant Büchner. He says the naturalist "*proves* that there are no other forces in nature besides the physical, chemical, and mechanical, and infers irresistibly that the organisms must also have been produced by these forces."—*Force and Matter*, Pref. to third what it is chemistry really expects to do, and what are the grounds for the expectation. As regards the first point, it should be remembered it is "organized," not simply "organic," matter we require, and whether organic or organized, it must be *living*, not *dead*. Even this does not rise to the full height of our legitimate demand. It is not enough to furnish us with a bit of organized living matter. We really want a living organism. Any thing that falls below the requirements of these demands has but little interest for us in the present case.

Professor Barker may make all the merely organic matter he pleases; but unless he shall favor us with at least one small portion of living organic matter, but little real advancement will have been made.

Dr. Maudsley says, (*Body and Mind*, Introduction,) "Exact experiment can alone put an end to this dispute; the one conclusive experiment, indeed, in proof of the origin of living from dead matter, will be to make life." Has this ever been performed by any one?

Professor Huxley, in his address at Liverpool in 1870, as President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, says: "I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call 'vital' may not some day be artificially brought together. All I feel justified in affirming is, that I see no reason for believing that the feat has yet been done."—*Lay Sermons*, p. 346. But "Chemistry doubts not her ability to make them all." For many, this extreme expectation is as good as the reality. It amounts to pretty much the same thing to have some confident professor predict it "will be so some day," as to be able to say "it is so." We protest, however, against this extravagant use of future possible resources. In this paragraph we are dealing not so much with the *elements*, as with the *forces* at the disposal of the chemist. They are physical, chemical, and mechanical. At this point let us hear from the calm and tolerant Büchner. He says the materialist "proves that there are no other forces in nature besides the physical, chemical, and mechanical, and infers irresistibly that the organisms must also have been produced by these forces."—*Force and Matter*, Pref. to third ed., xxvii. Grant Büchner his premises, and we must grant his conclusion; because nothing is clearer than that organisms, plant and animal, that were made—"organized"—by some force or power. If Büchner "proves there are no other forces in the universe save the physical, chemical, and mechanical," then, as he says, these forces made the organisms. By what evidence does he prove the point in question? Büchner, like the true "educated, thinking man" that he is, has not left us with a mere assertion unsupported by facts. Before quoting Büchner's "facts," we may notice some might object to his testimony. It may be said by some, he is incautious, unwise. He is honest and fearless, however, and simply bolts the plain conclusions of his case, *sans ceremonie.* It is, indeed, this plain, coarse honesty that has carried his book, in a brief time, up to a tenth edition even in Germany, and secured for it a translation into many other languages besides our own. And yet there would be difficulty in finding more repulsive material coarseness, and a harder, more unsympathetic, spirit, or more scientific arrogance, egotism, and intolerance, than is exhibited in this book. It has done good, however, in embodying and emphasizing a covert but wide-spreading "tendency" in the thought of the times. But to the proof.

Says Büchner, (Pref. to fourth ed., liv,) "*Presupposing* the existence of a *first organic element*, there is not *much* difficulty in *believing* that the whole organic world was *developed out of itself*, without the existence of a peculiar organic force." In this kind of statement he is joined by others, as Dr. Maudsley, for example, who says: "Admitting that the vital transforming matter is at *first* derived from vital structure, it is evident that the external force and matter transformed does in turn become transforming force, that is, vital. And if that takes place *after* the vital process has once commenced, is it, it may be asked, extravagant to suppose that a similar transformation might at some period have commenced the process, and may even now be doing so?"—*Body and Mind*, p. 140.

Come, now, be magnanimous. It surely cannot be considered "extravagant" to demand, much less to "suppose," these trifles. It matters not that in so doing, according to Maudsley, you concede the "one conclusive case," or that, according to Büchner, if you surrender this it is nothing less than the ed., xxvii. Grant Büchner his premises, and we must grant his conclusion; because nothing is clearer than that organisms, plant and animal, that were made—"organized"—by some force or power. If Büchner "proves there are no other forces in the universe save the physical, chemical, and mechanical," then, as he says, these forces made the organisms. By what evidence does he prove the point in question? Büchner, like the true "educated, thinking man" that he is, has not left us with a mere assertion unsupported by facts. Before quoting Büchner's "facts," we may notice some might object to his testimony. It may be said by some, he is incautious, unwise. He is honest and fearless, however, and simply tells the plain conclusions of his case, *sans ceremonie*. It is, indeed, this plain, coarse honesty that has carried his book, in a brief time, up to a tenth edition even in Germany, and secured for it a translation into many other languages besides our own. And yet there would be difficulty in finding more repulsive material coarseness, and a harder, more unsympathetic spirit, or more scientific arrogance, egotism, and intolerance, than is exhibited in this book. It has done good, however, in embodying and emphasizing a covert but wide-spreading "tendency" in the thought of the times. But to the proof.

Says Büchner, (Pref. to fourth ed., liv,) "*Presupposing* the existence of a *first organic element*, there is not much difficulty in believing that the whole organic world was developed *out of itself*, without the existence of a peculiar organic force." In this kind of statement he is joined by others, as Dr. Maudsley, for example, who says: "Admitting that the vital transforming matter is at *first* derived from vital structure, it is evident that the external force and matter transformed does in turn become transforming force, that is, vital. And if that takes place *after* the vital process has once commenced, is it, it may be asked, extravagant to suppose that a similar transformation might at some period have commenced the process, and may even now be doing so?"—*Body and Mind*, p. 161.

Come, now, be magnanimous. Learnedly cannot be considered "extravagant" to demand, much less to "suppose," mere trifles. It matters not that in so doing, according to Maudsley, you concede the "one conclusive case," or that, according to Büchner, if you surrender this it is nothing less than the "question of the first origin of organic beings on the earth, which *contains, in fact, the gist of the whole matter in dispute in regard to vital force.*"—*Preface* to fourth ed., liii. This being true, can it be considered extravagant to yield it up? But even should this be conceded, it seems there is really, even in Büchner's judgment, some "difficulty" in "believing" this modern genesis true. If this is so, what shall be said of the difficulty of *scientifically proving* it?

That no case of spontaneous generation has ever been made out, or with present means is likely to be, we suppose has been settled in the negative by the experiments of Pasteur;* but with an "educated, unprejudiced" man of Büchner's stamp, "it makes not the slightest difference that it is certainly unknown in what way the spontaneous generation of the first organic form was established."—*Preface* to fourth ed., liv. For, notwithstanding this, he says: "It seems clear to us that this generation was natural, and arose under *peculiar circumstances!*" Doubts may possibly arise in the minds of some as to whether the process alluded to was really "natural," and indeed as to what the word "natural" means, not to speak of "peculiar circumstances." For the benefit of such Büchner says, "that geological investigations have established the fact of a beginning of organic life upon the earth, *which leaves no doubt* that it can only have arisen naturally, and from inorganic forces, and it is perfectly indifferent whether or not we observe such a process now." This is conclusive. But here he fortifies his case behind the ponderous authority of Virchow, who says opportunely, "Chemistry has not yet succeeded in forming a *blastema*, nor physics in forming a cell. What does it matter!" Certainly, nothing whatever to an "educated man!"

It is hardly conceivable, after all that has been said, that it should be so; but it is possible that some one might be found who would insist on further "proofs." Here is one, from Virchow, as Büchner says, "easy to be understood:" "This first organic element," then, gentlemen, "this momentary manifestation of latent law, happened under *unusual conditions*," (*Büchner*, lv;) or, to be more explicit if possible, "we can only *imagine*

---

* Since writing the above, Dr. Bastian's book on the "Origin of the Lowest Organisms" has come to hand. A consideration of its statements might require a modification in some respects of the passage in the text.

"question of the first origin of organic beings on the earth, which comprises, in fact, the gist of the whole matter in dispute in regard to vital force."—Preface to fourth ed., liii. This being true, can it be considered extravagant to yield it up? But even should this be conceded, it seems there is really, even in Büchner's judgment, some "difficulty" in "believing" this modern genesis true. If this is so, what shall be said of the difficulty of scientifically proving it?

That no case of spontaneous generation has ever been made out, or with present means is likely to be, we suppose has been settled in the negative by the experiments of Pasteur;* but with an "educated, unprejudiced" man of Büchner's stamp, "it makes not the slightest difference that it is certainly unknown in what way the spontaneous generation of the first organic form was established."—Preface to fourth ed., lii. For, notwithstanding this, he says: "It seems clear to us that this generation was natural, and arose under peculiar circumstances!" Doubts may possibly arise in the minds of some as to whether the process alluded to was really "natural," and indeed as to what the word "natural" means, not to speak of "peculiar circumstances." For the benefit of such Büchner says, "that geological investigations have established the fact of a beginning of organic life upon the earth, which leaves no doubt that it can only have arisen naturally, and from inorganic forces, and it is perfectly indifferent whether or not we observe such a process now." This is conclusive. But here he fortifies his case behind the ponderous authority of Virchow, who says opportunely, "Chemistry has not yet succeeded in forming a blastema, nor physics in forming a cell. What does it matter?" Certainly, nothing whatever to an "educated man!"

It is hardly conceivable, after all that has been said, that it should be so; but it is possible that some one might be found who would insist on further "proofs." Here is one, from Virchow, as Büchner says, "easy to be understood:" "This first organic element," thus, gentlemen, "this momentary manifestation of latent law, happened under unusual conditions," (Büchner, lv;) or, to be more explicit if possible, "we can only imagine that at certain periods in the development of the earth, *unusual conditions* existed under which the elements, entering into new combinations, acquired, *in statu nascente*, vital motions, so that the usual mechanical conditions were transformed into vital conditions."

---

* Since writing the above, Dr. Bastian's book on the "Origin of the Lowest Organisms" has come to hand. A consideration of its statements might require a modification in some respects of the passage in the text.

After all this, is there any "reflecting," "unprejudiced" person who cannot see "that there are no other forces in nature besides the physical, chemical, and mechanical," and that plant and animal "organisms must also have been produced by these forces," and that there is abundant reason to think chemistry can make "all the complicated molecules of life?"

5. *Natural Laws.*—These, as "facts," are called in and freely used to explain the phenomena of living beings. By a surprisingly large number of persons it seems to be entirely sufficient to refer such phenomena and others, in part or in whole, to "natural laws." But what are natural laws? In answer to this question we might fill page after page with extracts from dozens of writers of the highest respectability who would substantially agree with the following: "The natural laws are rude, unbending *powers*."—*Vogt.* "Laws of nature *act mechanically*."—*Büchner.* "The cosmos an assemblage of natural laws."—*Büchner.* "Laws act;" "Law *does;*" "Laws are *free to act;*" "Law does it;" "Laws will not permit it," etc. No forms of expression are more common than these, and, soberly speaking, could be further from the truth.

Of all the subterfuges that have been resorted to, or self-impositions we have met with, this is perhaps the shallowest. A moment's unprejudiced reflection, it would seem, should be sufficient to dispel the illusion that a law *is* any thing, or can *do* any thing. What is a law, whether "natural" or otherwise, except the mere uniform mode or manner in which an agent acts or event occurs? A law *is* nothing, and *does* or *can do* nothing. It is the worst possible abuse of language to speak scientifically of a *law doing* any thing. Some might try to excuse themselves on rhetorical grounds; but we apprehend very few persons would be found who could not see the wide difference there is, and must be, between the rhetorical and scientific use of language.

6. *Dr. Carpenter's Reductio ad Absurdum.*—We now turn to the paper by Dr. Carpenter, contained in the volume

that at certain periods in the development of the earth, unusual conditions existed under which the elements, entering into new combinations, acquired, *in statu nascenti*, vital motions; so that the usual mechanical conditions were transformed into vital conditions."

After all this, is there any "reflecting," "unprejudiced" person who cannot see "that there are no other forces in nature besides the physical, chemical and mechanical," and that plant and animal "organisms must also have been produced by these forces," and that there is abundant reason to think chemistry can make "all the complicated molecules of life?"

5. *Natural Laws.*—These, as "facts," are called in and freely used to explain the phenomena of living beings. By a surprisingly large number of persons it seems to be entirely sufficient to refer such phenomena and others, in part or in whole, to "natural laws." But what are natural laws? In answer to this question we might fill page after page with extracts from scores of writers of the highest respectability who would substantially agree with the following: "The natural laws are rude, unbending *powers*."—*Vogt*. "Laws of nature *act mechanically*."—*Büchner*. "The cosmos an assemblage of natural laws."—*Büchner*. "Laws act;" "Law does;" "Laws are *free to act*;" "*Law does* it;" "Laws will not permit it," etc. No forms of expression are more common than these, and, soberly speaking, could be farther from the truth.

Of all the subterfuges that have been resorted to, or all the positions we have met with, this is perhaps the shallowest. A moment's unprejudiced reflection, it would seem, should be sufficient to dispel the illusion that a law *is* any thing, or can *do* any thing. What is a law, whether "natural" or otherwise, except the mere uniform mode or manner in which an agent acts or event occurs? A law *is* nothing, and *does* or can *do* nothing. It is the worst possible abuse of language to speak scientifically of a *law doing* any thing. Some might try to excuse themselves on rhetorical grounds; but we apprehend very few persons would be found who could not see the vast difference there is, and must be, between the rhetorical and scientific use of language.

6. *Dr. Carpenter's È Lecture at Aberdeen.*—We now turn to the paper by Dr. Carpenter, contained in the volume

of Professor Youmans, already so often alluded to. It is marked by that clearness and admirable spirit that characterize all his highly instructive and suggestive writings. There is but one point in the paper peculiarly worthy of notice in our present case. It is set forth in the following quotations:

Speaking of vital force, he says: "The prevalent opinion has until lately been, that this power is inherent in the germ, which has been supposed to derive from its parent, not merely its material substance, but a *nisus formativus—Bildungstreib* or *germ force*, in virtue of which it builds itself up into the likeness of its parent, and maintains itself in that likeness until the force is exhausted, at the same time imparting a fraction of it to each of its progeny. In this mode of viewing the subject, all the organizing force required to build up an oak or a palm, an elephant or a whale, must be concentrated in a minute particle only discernible by microscopic aid; and the aggregate of all the germ forces appertaining to the descendants, however numerous, of a common parentage, must have existed in their original progenitors. . . . And, in like manner, the germ force which has organized the bodies of all the individual men that have lived, from Adam down to the present day, must have been concentrated in the body of their common ancestor. A more complete *reductio ad absurdum* can scarcely be brought against any hypothesis, and we may consider it proved, that in some way or other fresh organizing force is being constantly supplied from without during the whole period of its activity. When we look carefully into the question, however, we find that what the germ really supplies is not the *force*, but the *directive agency;* thus rather resembling the control exercised by the superintendent builder, who is charged with working out the design of the architect, than the bodily force of the workmen, who labor under his guidance in the construction of the fabric." "The actual constructive force, as we learn from an extensive survey of the phenomena of life, is supplied by heat."—*Carpenter*, (*Youmans*,) pp. 411, 412. The real point at issue is clearly set forth in this extract. In each living germ Dr. Carpenter admits "constructive force" and "directive agency." These are not identical. Let us examine each in turn.

(1.) "*Organizing*" or "*constructive force*." What is it?

of Professor Youmans, already so often alluded to. It is marked by that clearness and admirable spirit that characterize all his highly instructive and suggestive writings. There is but one point in the paper peculiarly worthy of notice in our present case. It is set forth in the following quotation:

Speaking of vital force, he says: "The prevalent opinion has until lately been, that this power is inherent in the germ, which has been supposed to derive from its parent, not merely its material substance, but a *nisus formativus*—*Bildungstrieb* or *germ force*, in virtue of which it builds itself up into the likeness of its parent, and maintains itself in that likeness until the force is exhausted, at the same time imparting a fraction of it to each of its progeny. In this mode of viewing the subject, all the organizing force required to build up an oak or a palm, an elephant or a whale, must be concentrated in a minute particle only discernible by microscopic aid; and the aggregate of all the germ forces appertaining to the descendants, however numerous, of a common parentage, must have existed in their original progenitors. . . . And, in like manner, the germ force which has organized the bodies of all the individual men that have lived, from Adam down to the present day, must have been concentrated in the body of their common ancestor. A more complete *reductio ad absurdum* can scarcely be brought against any hypothesis, and we may consider it proved, that in some way or other fresh organizing force is being constantly supplied from without during the whole period of its activity. When we look carefully into the question, however, we find that what the germ really supplies is not the *force*, but the *directive agency*; thus rather resembling the control exercised by the superintendent builder, who is charged with working out the design of the architect, than the bodily force of the workmen, who labor under his guidance in the construction of the fabric." "The actual constructive force, as we learn from an extensive survey of the phenomena of life, is supplied by heat."—(*Carpenter*, (*Youmans*) pp. 417, 418). The real point at issue is clearly set forth in this extract. In each living germ Dr. Carpenter admits "constructive force" and "directive agency." These are not identical. Let us examine each in turn.

(1.) "Organizing" or "constructive *force*." What is it?

Dr. Carpenter says it is "supplied by heat; or, better still, "the correlation between heat and the organizing force of plants is not less intimate than that which exists *between heat* and *motion*."—*Ibid.*, p. 420.

In regard to this last statement we must really suspend judgment until we can learn what kind of a *correlation* is possible between heat and motion! We are still so obtuse as not to see how such a thing can be. (See January Quarterly, p. 18, *et seq.*) This constructive agency, we must steadily bear in mind, comes from without, and is transformed heat. What is meant by a constructive force? Why, a force that constructs. It is like unto the "workmen" who take and lay the bricks, mortar, etc., and, in short, construct the house. The superintendent or "directive" agent does not "construct, he simply directs." What is this transformed or disguised heat understood to construct? Nothing less than the surpassingly complex and wonderful organisms called plants and animals. If it requires intelligent workmen—namely, "constructive force"—to build a house or a bridge, how much less intelligent shall the workmen be that builds the human body? That the human body is built up, "organized," no one, it seems, could deny. Neither can it be denied that it is a more wonderful structure than any that man ever made, or sane man could pretend to make, nor that a very high degree of intelligence is exhibited in its construction. But the actual "constructive force" is transformed heat. Plan or purpose is clearly manifested in the human body and its construction. This impersonal "constructive force" must be able to understand this plan in order to obey the behests of the equally impersonal directive agency. Can we escape the obvious dilemma in which such considerations place us? We must admit one of two things. Either the "constructive force" is intelligent, rational, or an unintelligent agent performs a work, in doing which intelligence of a high order would seem to be a necessary condition. This is not the place to trace the two paths pointed out, even to their more obvious consequences. We hope to do this hereafter. If we admit that constructive force is vital force, what clear evidence have we that heat really supplies it of such kind that it may be legitimately compared to men working under a director or superintendent? Not any

Dr. Carpenter says it is "supplied by heat; or, better still, "the correlation between heat and the organizing force of plants is not less intimate than that which exists between *heat and motion*."—*Ibid.*, p. 420.

In regard to this last statement we must really suspend judgment until we can learn what kind of a correlation is possible between heat and motion? We are still so obtuse as not to see how such a thing can be. (See January *Quarterly*, p. 18, *et seq.*) This constructive agency, we must steadily bear in mind, comes from without, and is transformed heat. What is meant by a constructive force? Why, a force that constructs. It is like unto the "workmen" who take and lay the bricks, mortar, etc., and, in short, construct the house. The superintendent or "directive" agent does not "construct, he simply directs." What is this transformed or disguised heat, understood to construct? Nothing less than the surpassingly complex and wonderful organisms called plants and animals. If it requires intelligent workmen—namely, "constructive force"—to build a house or a bridge, how much less intelligent shall the workmen be that builds the human body? That the human body is built up, "organized," no one, it seems, could deny. Neither can it be denied that it is a more wonderful structure than any that man ever made, or sane man could pretend to make, nor that a very high degree of intelligence is exhibited in its construction. But the actual "constructive force" is transformed heat. Plan or purpose is clearly manifested in the human body and its construction. This impersonal "constructive force" must be able to understand the plan in order to obey the behests of the equally impersonal directive agency. Can we escape the obvious dilemma in which such considerations place us? We must admit one of two things. Either the "constructive force" is intelligent, rational, or an unintelligent agent performs a work, in doing which intelligence of a high order would seem to be a necessary condition. This is not the place to trace the two paths pointed out, even to their most obvious consequences. We hope to do this hereafter. If we admit that constructive force is vital force, what clear evidence have we that heat really supplies it of such kind that it may be legitimately compared to men working under a director or superintendent? Not any that we know of. That heat is in some way necessary to the germination of seeds and growth of plants, and the hatching of eggs or growth and life of animals, there can be no doubt. That the heat is taken up, transformed, and used in some way, there can be no question. But that heat generates vital force, though it is used in construction, there is no real proof whatever.

But we do not understand Dr. Carpenter to insist that "constructive force" *is vital force.* This is more properly set down to the credit of "directive agency." This latter is the vital force of the germ. The proof might be never so clear that "constructive force" is transformed heat; but unless it is shown that constructive and vital force are identical, we have not advanced a single step. We are quite willing to surrender "constructive force" for the present to the *reductio ad absurdum* of Dr. Carpenter.

(2.) Let us now turn for a moment to the "directive agency." It seems to us, if Dr. Carpenter had only looked a little more "carefully into the question," he would have seen that his directive agency is exposed to his *reductio ad absurdum* just the same as his "organizing force." Where does the offspring get its "directive agency" unless from the parent? As with the "organizing force," so with the "directive agency." The primitive stock with which the race began —which Adam divided with Cain and Abel, not to mention Eve, and so on down to Dr. Carpenter—would be exhausted as surely in the one case as in the other. The voracious *reductio ad absurdum* which Dr. Carpenter has turned loose, eats up indiscriminately both "organizing force" and "directive agency." *All* the vital force is transformed heat or *none.* What shall be done? It seems to us there are only three positions that can be taken. They are:

(*a.*) To disavow the *reductio ad absurdum.* But this does not seem possible.

(*b.*) To surrender our "directive agency" to it, as well as "organizing force," and thus set both down as transformed heat—transformed by we know not what—or,

(*c.*) To admit that "directive agency," at least, is supplied from some unacknowledged source.

As regards these three positions, we may dismiss the first that we know of. That heat is in some way necessary to the germination of seeds and growth of plants, and the hatching of eggs or growth and life of animals, there can be no doubt. That the heat is taken up, transformed, and used in some way, there can be no question. But that heat generates vital force, though it is used in construction, there is no real proof whatever.

But we do not understand Dr. Carpenter to insist that "constructive force" is *vital force*. This is more properly set down to the credit of "directive agency." This latter is the vital force of the germ. The proof might be never so clear that "constructive force" is transformed heat; but unless it is shown that constructive and vital force are identical, we have not advanced a single step. We are quite willing to surrender "constructive force" for the present to the *reductio ad absurdum* of Dr. Carpenter.

(2.) Let us now turn for a moment to the "directive agency." It seems to us, if Dr. Carpenter had only looked a little more "carefully into the question," he would have seen that his *directive* agency is exposed to his *reductio ad absurdum* just the same as his "organizing force." Whence does the offspring get its "directive agency" unless from the parent? As with the "organizing force," so with the "directive agency." The primitive stock with which the race began —which Adam divided with Cain and Abel, not to mention Eve, and so on down to Dr. Carpenter—would be exhausted as surely in the one case as in the other. The veracious *reductio ad absurdum* which Dr. Carpenter has turned loose, eats up indiscriminately both "organizing force" and "directive agency." *All* the vital force is transformed heat or *none*. What shall be done? It seems to us there are only three positions that can be taken. They are:

(*a.*) To disavow the *reductio ad absurdum*. But this does not seem possible.

(*b.*) To surrender our "directive agency" to it, as well as "organizing force," and thus set both down as transformed heat—transformed by we know not what—or,

(*c.*) To admit that "directive agency," at least, is supplied from some unacknowledged source.

As regards these three positions, we may dismiss the first without ceremony. We may unhesitatingly yield something to the *reductio ad absurdum*, but it remains yet to be proved that it is vital force; and if so, where is the proof of the correlation between heat and vital force?

As regards the second, if it should be assumed, we would be obliged to face a host of consequences of which the following is only a partial list:

First. It makes all depend on heat, or some equivalent form of physical force.

Second. It does away virtually with "directive agency," and abandons the whole field to "organizing force," without intelligent direction to do a work bearing the clearest marks of a high degree of intelligence.

Third. It proposes effects that wholly transcend their assumed causes.

Fourth. It is in direct opposition to facts.

Fifth. It is not directly supported, we venture to remark, by one indubitable fact.

As regards the third position, we believe it to be the true one. Its full statement and support we reserve for a future occasion. This point, to which we have been led by our analysis of Dr. Carpenter's case, we regard as the principal one in the present essay, and to be the one from which a constructive or positive review should take its departure. In it the *nodus* of the whole question lies. But we dismiss it for the present, to conclude our examination of other branches of evidence relied on to prove there is a correlation between the physical and vital forces similar to that known to exist between the physical forces themselves. In a former article we divided the evidence referred to into three kinds: I. FACTS. II. ANALOGIES. III. ASSERTIONS AND IMAGININGS. Here we terminate our survey of evidence of the first kind.

We believe that in our examination we have exhausted the catalogue of "facts" in *kind*, though not numerically so. But we venture to say, no facts are on record stronger than those we have just examined. We have no hesitancy in making this assertion, nor in facing any of its consequences. We will not say a correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces may not "some day"—or in some other way—be shown; but we do say, the first clear step has yet to be taken in that di-

rection, so far as the facts go, toward establishing that *kind* of correlation required by many modern physicists.

II. ANALOGIES.—When it is considered how few the things are about which we can be demonstrably certain in life, the justice of the remark of Bishop Butler, made in the Introduction to his *Analogy*, will be apparent, that "probability is the very guide of life." It is not to be wondered at, then, that in an obscure subject, as the one we are considering certainly is in some parts, that the aid of probabilities or analogies should be invoked where facts are wanting. And this is right, provided analogy be used in a legitimate way.

In regard to the subject in hand, it has often been resorted to. In a few cases the analogies have appeared so striking and satisfactory to some as almost, if not quite, to warrant their transfer from the domain of probabilities to that of facts. It is to a few such analogies we would direct attention now. But, it should be remembered, probable evidence, however much it may be relied on in the ordinary affairs of life, or however great its value as an aid in discovery, has, when it stands alone, almost no value as proof in science. Bearing this in mind, let us pass to an examination of the principal analogies by which it has been attempted, in one form or another, either to show a correlation of physical, vital, and mental forces, or to establish positions involving it.

There are many such analogies—such as the analogy of magnetism to vitality, the analogy of crystallization to organization, etc.—but we have space only to examine one or two cases. We wish to direct attention now in particular to the analogy by which Professor Huxley has sought to render what is called "vital force," ridiculous. This analogy to which we refer was intended to be the strongest, as it is the most notable, feature in his somewhat famous lecture on *protoplasm*, or the "Physical Basis of Life." The lecture has found a host of reviewers. None of them, however, have given it a more vigorous or searching examination than Dr. Stirling, at Edinburgh, in Scotland. Among other things he deals with the analogy, but, as it seems to us, does not carry his examination as far as it deserves to be. We will therefore quote the language of Professor Huxley, and proceed to an independent examination.

rection, so far as the facts go toward establishing such kind of correlation required by many modern physicists.

II. Analogies.—When it is considered how few the things are about which we can be demonstrably certain in life, the justice of the remark of Bishop Butler, made in the introduction to his Analogy, will be apparent, that "probability is the very guide of life." It is not to be wondered at, then, that in an obscure subject, as the one we are considering certainly is in some parts, that the aid of probabilities or analogies should be invoked where facts are wanting. And this is right, provided analogy be used in a legitimate way.

In regard to the subject in hand, it has often been resorted to. In a few cases the analogies have appeared so striking and satisfactory to some as almost, if not quite, to warrant their transfer from the domain of probabilities to that of facts. It is to a few such analogies we would direct attention now. But, it should be remembered, probable evidence, however much it may be relied on in the ordinary affairs of life, or however great its value as an aid in discovery, has, when it stands alone, almost no value as proof in science. Bearing this in mind, let us pass to an examination of the principal analogies by which it has been attempted, in one form or another, either to show a correlation of physical, vital, and mental forces, or to establish positions involving it.

There are many such analogies—such as the analogy of magnetism to vitality, the analogy of crystallization to organization, etc.—but we have space only to examine one or two cases. We wish to direct attention now in particular to the analogy by which Professor Huxley has sought to render what is called "vital force," ridiculous. This analogy to which we refer was intended to be the strongest, as it is the most notable, feature in his somewhat famous lecture on protoplasm, or the "Physical Basis of Life." The lecture has found a host of reviewers. None of them, however, have given it a more vigorous or searching examination than Dr. Stirling, at Edinburgh, in Scotland. Among other things he deals with the analogy, but, as it seems to us, does not carry his examination as far as it deserves to be. We will therefore quote the language of Professor Huxley, and proceed to an independent examination.

Says Professor Huxley, (*Lay Sermons*, pp. 136–138:) "When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in a certain proportion, and an electric spark is passed through them, they disappear, and a quantity of water, equal in weight to the sum of their weights, appears in their place. There is not the slightest parity between the passive and active powers of the water, and those of the oxygen and hydrogen which have given rise to it. At thirty-two degrees Fahrenheit, and far below that temperature, oxygen and hydrogen are elastic gaseous bodies, whose particles tend to rush away from one another with great force. Water at that same temperature is a strong, though brittle, solid, whose particles tend to cohere in definite geometrical shapes, and sometimes build up frosty imitations of the most complex forms of vegetable foliage. Nevertheless, we call these and many other strange phenomena the properties of water, and we do not hesitate to believe that in some way or another they result from the properties of the component elements of the water. We do not assume that a something called 'aquosity' entered into and took possession of the oxide of hydrogen as soon as it was formed, and then guided the aqueous particles to their places in the facets of the crystal, or among the leaflets of the hoar frost; on the contrary, we live in the hope and faith that, by the advance of molecular physics, we shall by and by be able to see our way as clearly from the *constituents* of water to the *properties* of water as we are now able to deduce the operations of a watch from the form of its parts, and the manner in which they are put together.

"Is the case in any way changed when carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equivalent weight of the matter of life makes its appearance? It is true that there is no sort of parity between the properties of the components and the properties of the resultant; but neither was there in the case of the water. It is also true that what I have spoken of as the influence of pre-existing living matter is something quite unintelligible; but does any body quite comprehend the *modus operandi* of the electric spark which traverses a mixture of oxygen and hydrogen?

"What justification is there, then, for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no

Says Professor Huxley, (*Lay Sermons*, pp. 136-139) "When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in a certain proportion, and an electric spark is passed through them, they disappear, and a quantity of water, equal in weight to the sum of their weights, appears in their place. There is not the slightest parity between the passive and active powers of the water, and those of the oxygen and hydrogen which have given rise to it. At thirty-two degrees Fahrenheit, and far below that temperature, oxygen and hydrogen are elastic gaseous bodies, whose particles tend to rush away from one another with great force. Water at that same temperature is a strong, though brittle, solid, whose particles tend to cohere in definite geometrical shapes, and sometimes build up frosty imitations of the most complex forms of vegetable foliage. Nevertheless, we call these and many other strange phenomena the properties of water, and we do not hesitate to believe that in some way or another they result from the properties of the component elements of the water. We do not assume that a something called 'aquosity' entered into and took possession of the oxide of hydrogen as soon as it was formed, and then guided the aqueous particles to their places in the facets of the crystal, or among the leaflets of the hoar frost; on the contrary, we live in the hope and faith that, by the advance of molecular physics, we shall by and by be able to see our way as clearly from the *constituents* of water to the *properties* of water as we are now able to deduce the operations of a watch from the form of its parts, and the manner in which they are put together.

"Is the case in any way changed when carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equivalent weight of the matter of life makes its appearance? It is true that there is no sort of parity between the properties of the components and the properties of the resultant; but neither was there in the case of the water. It is also true that what I have spoken of as the influence of pre-existing living matter is something quite unintelligible; but does any body quite comprehend the *modus operandi* of the electric spark which traverses a mixture of oxygen and hydrogen?

"What justification is there, then, for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no representative in the not living matter that gave rise to it? What better philosophical *status* has 'vitality' than 'aquosity?' And why should 'vitality' hope for a better fate than the other 'itys' which have disappeared since Martinus Scriblerus accounted for the operation of the meat-jack by its inherent 'meat-roasting quality,' and scorned the 'materialism' of those who explained the turning of the spit by a certain mechanism worked by the draught of the chimney? If the properties of water may be properly said to result from the nature and disposition of its component molecules, I can find no intelligible ground for refusing to say that the properties of protoplasm result from the nature and disposition of its molecules."

As Dr. Stirling truly says, "Analogy, never being identity, is apt to betray; the difference it hides may be essential, that is, while the likeness it shows may be unessential so far as the conclusion is concerned." What are the complementary terms compared in this analogy? In general they appear to be water and protoplasm. Let us descend to a detailed examination of the particular steps in this analogy to see how they agree. We will make a tabular parallel statement of the points in which, if the analogy is true, it must hold good. We need not say, if it should fail in one essential point, for strict scientific purposes —whether positive or negative—it is worthless.

PROTOPLASM.	WATER.
1. Elements: H. O. N. C.	1. Elements: H. O.
2. Combining agent: Protoplasm. "When carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equal weight of the matter of life makes its appearance," etc.—*Lay Sermons*, p. 137.	2. Combining agent: Electric spark. "When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in a certain proportion, and an electric spark passed through them, they disappear, and a quantity of water, equal in weight to the sum of their weights, appears in their place."—*Lay Serm.*, p. 136.
3. Result, (Protoplasm.)	3. Result, (Water.)
4. Can separate its constituent chemical elements, but cannot by any known chemical or physical means cause them to recombine to form protoplasm.	4. Can combine and recombine at will.
5. Cannot by any chemical or physical means convert protoplasm into muscle, which may be loosely said to be to protoplasm what *ice* is to *water*, nor cannot convert muscle back into protoplasm.	5. Can convert water into ice, and ice into water, at pleasure by ordinary physical and chemical forces.

representative in the net living matter that gave rise to it? What better philosophical status has 'vitality' than 'aquosity'? And why should 'vitality' hope for a better fate than the other 'itys' which have disappeared since Martinus Scriblerus accounted for the operation of the meat-jack by its inherent 'meat-roasting quality,' and scorned the 'materialism' of those who explained the turning of the spit by a certain mechanism worked by the draught of the chimney? If the properties of water may be properly said to result from the nature and disposition of its component molecules, I can find no intelligible ground for refusing to say that the properties of protoplasm result from the nature and disposition of its molecules."

As Dr. Stirling truly says, "Analogy, never being identity, is apt to betray; the difference it hides may be essential, that is, while the likeness it shows may be unessential so far as the conclusion is concerned." What are the complementary terms compared in this analogy? In general they appear to be water and protoplasm. Let us descend to a detailed examination of the particular steps in this analogy to see how they agree. We will make a tabular parallel statement of the points in which, if the analogy is true, it must hold good. We need not say, if it should fail in one essential point, for strict scientific purposes—whether positive or negative—it is worthless.

Water.	Protoplasm.
1. Elements: H. O.	1. Elements: H. C. N. O.
2. Combining agent: Electric spark. "When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in a certain proportion, and an electric spark passed through them, they disappear, and a quantity of water, equal in weight to the sum of their weights appears in their place."—*Lay Serm.*, p. 136.	2. Combining agent: Protoplasm. "When carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equal weight of the matter of life makes its appearance," etc.—*Lay Sermons*, p. 137.
3. Result, (Water.)	3. Result, (Protoplasm.)
4. Can combine and recombine at will.	4. Can separate its constituent chemical elements, but cannot by any known chemical or physical means cause them to recombine to form protoplasm.
5. Can convert water into ice, and ice into water, at pleasure by ordinary physical and chemical forces.	5. Cannot by any chemical or physical means convert protoplasm into ammonia, which they (is loosely said) to be to protoplasm what ice is to water, and cannot convert ammonia back into protoplasm.

Besides these, there are other points in which water and protoplasm might be compared—such as that you can kill protoplasm, apparently without disturbing its chemical constitution, but cannot kill water, because it was never living, etc.; but those we have mentioned are essential ones and must suffice. We call attention, however, to the remarkable fact that in the five points in which the analogous terms are legitimately compared, they disagree in all. The verdict is unanimous against the likeness of the cases, which would seem to warrant us in voting them out *sans ceremonie.* But this analogy of Professor Huxley's has been so much noticed, and has excited so much popular interest, that we ought not to pass it by without more detailed notice. We will accordingly examine some of the points above compared in detail.

1. *The Elements.*—The higher class of what are called "organic compounds" are distinguished by at least two characteristics from the compounds that can be made by the chemist by the synthesis of the simple elements in the laboratory. They are, first, the fewer number of elements; and, second, the smaller number of equivalents of each element in the latter as compared with the former.

(*a.*) *Number of Elements.*—Ordinarily, in compounds that can be made in the laboratory two elements alone combine, as $H\,O =$ water. More than this may be united in a double compound, as in sulphate of soda $= S\,O^3 + Na\,O$. The sulphuric acid ($S\,O^3$) unites with the soda ($Na\,O$.) The elements combine in pairs. This is the rule in artificial compounds.

In a few instances, however, the case *seems* to be different. *Urea* may be taken, perhaps, as one of the best examples. It contains $C^2\,H^4\,N^2\,O^2$. But there are not half a dozen examples of compounds resulting from artificial synthesis of the elements in the whole range of organic chemistry as good as this; and there is good reason to suspect it of being a double compound, namely, cyanic acid and ammonia.

The list is a most beggarly one, and affords no real ground for even hoping the higher organic compounds, such as dead albumen, can ever be made in the laboratory. Certainly *urea* is not a spontaneous production there. If the separate elements are given, the processes are many and delicate for obtaining it. Will it be pretended, since the simple compounds

Besides these, there are other points in which water and protoplasm might be compared—such as that you can kill protoplasm, apparently without disturbing its chemical constitution, but cannot kill water, because it was never living—but those we have mentioned are essential ones and must suffice. We call attention, however, to the remarkable fact that in the five points in which the analogous terms are legitimately compared, they disagree in all. The verdict is unanimous against the likeness of the cases, which would seem to warrant us in voting them out *non sequuntur*. But this analogy of Professor Huxley's has been so much noticed, and has excited so much popular interest, that we ought not to pass it by without more detailed notice. We will accordingly examine some of the points above compared in detail.

1. *The Elements.*—The higher class of what are called "organic compounds" are distinguished by at least two characteristics from the compounds that can be made by the chemist by the synthesis of the simple elements in the laboratory. They are, first, the fewer number of elements; and, second, the smaller number of equivalents of each element in the latter as compared with the former.

(*a*.) *Number of Elements.*—Ordinarily, in compounds that can be made in the laboratory two elements alone combine, as $H\,O$ = water. More than this may be united in a double compound, as in sulphate of soda = $S\,O^3 + Na\,O$. The sulphuric acid ($S\,O^3$) unites with the soda ($Na\,O$.) The elements combine in pairs. This is the rule in artificial compounds.

In a few instances, however, the case seems to be different. *Urea* may be taken, perhaps, as one of the best examples. It contains $C^2\,H^4\,N^2\,O^2$. But there are not half a dozen examples of compounds resulting from artificial synthesis of the elements in the whole range of organic chemistry as good as this; and there is good reason to suspect it of being a double compound, namely, cyanic acid and ammonia.

The list is a most beggarly one, and affords no valid ground for even hoping the higher organic compounds, such as dead albumen, can ever be made in the laboratory. Certainly urea is not a spontaneous production there. If the separate elements are given, the processes are many and delicate for obtaining it. Will it be pretended, since the simple compounds are only made by careful procedure in the laboratory, that the more complex are made by the physical and chemical forces spontaneously? Yes. It is not pretended only, but confidently and repeatedly asserted, and in regard to compounds that defy the delicate and bewildering appliances of the chemist. Who takes the place and performs the office of the chemist in forming these complex compounds? The analogy, then, between water and protoplasm, is on this important point a failure. A seemingly impassable chasm exists between them on the score of disparity of elements.

(*b*.) As regards the *number of equivalents of each element*, the difference is still greater than in the first case. Let us compare the chemical formulæ of water and of albumen as sufficiently near that of protoplasm to answer our purpose. An atom of water consists of one equivalent of hydrogen and one of oxygen; but an atom of albumen consists, we will say, of about thirty-six atoms of carbon, twenty-seven of hydrogen, four of nitrogen, and twelve of oxygen. It is distinctly understood as impossible, by any known chemical or physical means at command in the laboratory, to make such compounds. We cannot be deprived of the force of this truth by any talk about the "presumption" of "setting limits to what chemistry may do in the future." We can have nothing to do in our present case with the conjectural or possible future of chemistry. If it is presumption to set limits to its future, it is worse than presumption to draw on its improbable future for the support of any actual proposition. But is this not constantly done by those who go on and tell us what chemistry "will do some day," and who on the impression thus created proceed to rear presumptions for present use? A case must be "hard up" that is forced to seek such aid.

Now, once again, by what means do the chemical and physical forces combine the elements in these organic compounds in so much higher proportions than is possible in the laboratory, where you not only find all these forces, but a chemist to guide, coax, and compel them? What takes the place of the chemist and his apparatus in these cases that so far transcend his power? It seems to us quite clear the analogy is far from perfect on this score. Let it be remembered, we have not yet arrived at the place where "aquosity" is are only made by careful procedure in the laboratory, that the more complex are made by the physical and chemical forces spontaneously? Yes. It is not pretended only, but confidently and repeatedly asserted, and in regard to compounds that defy the delicate and bewildering appliances of the chemist. Who takes the place and performs the office of the chemist in forming these complex compounds? The analogy, then, between water and protoplasm, is on this important point a failure. A seemingly impassable chasm exists between them on the score of disparity of elements.

(*b*.) As regards the *number of equivalents of each element*, the difference is still greater than in the first case. Let us compare the chemical formula of water and of albumen as sufficiently near that of protoplasm to answer our purpose. An atom of water consists of one equivalent of hydrogen and one of oxygen; but an atom of albumen consists, we will say, of about thirty-six atoms of carbon, twenty-seven of hydrogen, four of nitrogen, and twelve of oxygen. It is distinctly understood as impossible, by any known chemical or physical means at command in the laboratory, to make such compounds. We cannot be deprived of the force of this truth by any talk about the "presumption" of "setting limits to what chemistry may do in the future." We can have nothing to do in our present case with the conjectural or possible future of chemistry. If it is presumption to set limits to its future, it is worse than presumption to draw on its imperishable future for the support of any actual proposition. But is this not constantly done by those who go on and tell us what chemistry "will do some day," and who on the impression thus created proceed to rear presumptions for present use? A case must be "hard up" that is forced to seek such aid.

Now, once again, by what means do the chemical and physical forces combine the elements in these organic compounds in so much higher proportions than is possible in the laboratory, where you not only find all these forces, but a chemist to guide, coax, and compel them? What takes the place of the chemist and his apparatus in these cases that so far surpassed his power? It seems to us quite clear the analogy is far from perfect on this score. Let it be remembered, we have not yet arrived at the place where "agnosty" is jocularly slipped in. We now come to the second step in our comparison.

2. *The Combining Agent.*—This, as we have seen by the tabular statement, is the "*electric spark*" in the case of the water. On the other side of the analogy it is *protoplasm.* Can these fitly answer each other? The "electric spark" seems to be the cause of the union of the oxygen and hydrogen. The "living protoplasm" seems to be the cause of the union of the "water, carbonic acid, and ammonia." In this respect there is a likeness; but beneath it the differences are so many and profound, it seems singular Professor Huxley did not see and pause at them. Some of them we subjoin in a tabular form. It will serve to show that the deeper we carry the so-called analogy down the wider the divergence becomes:

ELECTRIC SPARK.	PROTOPLASM.
a. Form of physical force.	*a.* Form of living matter.
b. Can be used by the chemist.	*b.* Cannot be so used.
c. This is a simple, immaterial thing.	*c.* This is a compound, material thing.
d. The result of the action of the electric spark is, not more electricity, but water.	*d.* The result is more protoplasm.
e. You cannot kill the electric spark, since it has no life.	*e.* You may kill the protoplasm.

We have said that the true counterpart of the electric spark is the protoplasm, or whatever there is in it whereby it causes the elements to unite to form new protoplasm, as the electric spark causes the oxygen and hydrogen to unite to form water. This is the true statement of the case. That power or force in the protoplasm, whatever it may be, which causes the elements to combine to form new protoplasm, is what is called the "vital force" by those who hold there is such a thing. We repeat, its true and only counterpart is the electric spark. But what is the counterpart assigned by Professor Huxley? Instead of the electric spark, it is a purely fictitious something called "aquosity." A more serious dislocation of the corresponding terms in the analogy could hardly be made. This "aquosity" is no offset to "vitality." They are no more parallel in reality than white and black are. His "aquosity" is even more ridiculous than he would have it appear; but the disparagement which by means of it he would transfer to the

other side, would fall anywhere else with as much propriety as where he would have it fall. Certainly it does not alight on "vitality," whatever Professor Huxley may have said to the contrary.

But suppose the case to be as Professor Huxley says. We should then have, according to him, "aquosity" in the water and "vitality" in the protoplasm. The vitality in the protoplasm, in this case, is invoked to explain the facts connected with the making of new protoplasm out of the simple elements, or compounds, by the already existing protoplasm. But what is this "aquosity" invoked to do? To enable the water endowed with it to form more water from the elements? No; but to do what the other case never contemplated doing with its "vitality." "Aquosity" is used for making ice from the water. To make the cases, as they are given by Professor Huxley, parallel, "vitality" in the protoplasm should be used—not in making new protoplasm, which it very properly does, but in converting protoplasm into muscle. The force that makes muscle out of protoplasm may or may not be the same as that which makes protoplasm out of the simple elements. But whether or not this is so does not concern us; we are alone engaged in this analogy with the latter. To exhibit at one glance the dislocations that exist in this analogy, we will put them in a tabular form:

AQUOSITY SIDE.	VITALITY SIDE.
a. Elements.	*a.* Elements.
b. Electric spark.	*b.* ———
c. Water.	*c.* Protoplasm.
d. ———	*d.* Protoplasm.
e. "Aquosity."	*e.* ———
f. Ice.	*f.* ———

But suppose, now, that instead of the water forming ice, it should quietly form new water from oxygen and hydrogen, as the protoplasm forms new protoplasm, and without the aid of the electric spark, would we not have a place for Professor Huxley's "aquosity," or some other "ity?". Water that could do what we have supposed would be considered by every thinking person as having a force or power water, as we know it, does not have. That power we might very well call "aquosity," and such a power alone would be the counterpart of the "vitality" of the protoplasm.

But before leaving this dislocated analogy, we cannot forbear expressing our surprise that Professor Huxley should have trusted himself so confidently to such a "broken reed" as his analogy is. Moreover, it is our opinion that something more serious can be got out of his "aquosity" than he has suspected. It is our opinion, indeed, that in the conversion of water into ice there is a force or power in operation which Professor Huxley has entirely overlooked, but which we dismiss for the present, with the promise to point it out at a later period in this essay. A more wretched failure of an analogy which was produced with so much confidence and complacency it would be difficult to find.

As regards the other three points named in the beginning, in which the two terms in the analogy must agree if it is a true one, their bare statement would seem to be sufficient. It surely cannot be thought a matter of small importance that the results should be so dissimilar. In the one case protoplasm is the combining agent, and the result is more protoplasm. In the other case the combining agent is the electrical spark, and the result is not more electricity, but water. The other two points we dismiss without further notice. The result to which we seem to have been led is not more barren than those that the examination of any other analogy, used for a similar purpose, would be.

3. Take still another case of analogy: "When the larva becomes a butterfly, the process is of the same kind as when the sheet-iron becomes the nail."—*Krähmer*, (*Büchner*,) *Force and Matter*, p. 225. Truly, this is plain and blunt enough. Now, for one moment, what is the "process" by which sheet-iron becomes a nail? We notice, first, it is plain the sheet-iron does make the nail, as the larva seems to make the butterfly. The process of nail-making from sheet-iron is carried on by visible machinery. Where is the "machinery," visible or invisible, for making a butterfly out of a larva? It is in the perplexed endeavor to answer similar questions we hear of "molecular machinery," "cell laboratories," etc., "subtle influences," "certain conditions," "sundry circumstances," "mysterious agents," etc. But, in the second place, the machinery that makes the nails does not run itself. The force of steam, we will suppose, drives it. Need we ask what there is in the butterfly-making "process" that corresponds to this?

But before leaving this celebrated analogy, we cannot forbear expressing our surprise that Professor Huxley should have trusted himself so confidently to such a "broken reed" as its analogy is. Moreover, it is our opinion that something more serious has to get out of his "watery" than he has supposed. It is our opinion, indeed, that in the combination of water too there is a force or power in operation which Professor Huxley has entirely overlooked, but which we forbear for the present, with the purpose to point it out at a later period in this essay. A more wretched failure of an analogy which was produced with so much confidence and complacency it would be difficult to find.

As regards the other three points named in the beginning in which the two terms in the analogy must agree if it is a true one, their bare statement would seem to be sufficient. It surely cannot be thought a matter of small importance that the results should be so dissimilar. In the one case protoplasm is the combining agent, and the result is more protoplasm. In the other case the combining agent is the electrical spark, and the result is not more electricity, but water. The other two points we dismiss without further notice. The result to which we seem to have been led is not more favorable than those that the examination of any other analogy, used for a similar purpose, would be.

8. Take still another case of analogy: "When the larva becomes a butterfly, the process is of the same kind as when the sheet-iron becomes the nail."—Kirchner, (*Büchner*,) *Force and Matter*, p. 252. Truly, this is plain and blunt enough. Now, for one moment, what is the "process" by which sheet-iron becomes a nail? We notice, first, it is plain the sheet-iron does make the nail, as the larva seems to make the butterfly. The process of nail-making from sheet-iron is carried on by visible machinery. Where is the "machinery," visible or invisible, for making a butterfly out of a larva? It is in the perplexed endeavor to answer similar questions we hear of "molecular machinery," "cell laboratories," etc., "subtle influences," "certain conditions," "sundry circumstances," "mystic agencies," etc. But, in the second place, the machinery that makes the nails does not run itself. The force of steam, we will suppose, drives it. Next we ask, what there is in the butterfly-making "process" that corresponds to this?

Finally, the machinery by which nails are made did not make itself, does not control or repair itself, nor go nor stop of its own choice. Who does this? Why, intelligent men, who are justly proud of the results. Now, who made and controls and repairs this "butterfly machinery?" Among the many analogies that have been offered in support of the doctrine of the correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces—or, what amounts to the same thing, their identity—the foregoing are, perhaps, among the most striking. But in each case they have proved total failures when submitted to a careful examination such as they should abide if they were true. From these we now turn to our third or the last class of evidence:

III. Assertions and Imaginings.—Of the former we have any number, and in all degrees of positiveness. So far as they have any basis at all, they rest on facts and analogies similar to those we have already examined. But they deserve a separate notice. They will serve to show how far "educated men of science" are from saying what they do not know or cannot prove. This is a common fault of "metaphysicians" and theological or "ecclesiastical" persons, *et id genus omne.* But men of science, accustomed to examining every thing with its unsparing rigor, do not fall into such "absurdities."

But here are some specimens of assertion: "What is called vitality is not a peculiar force, but a collection of the forces of inorganic matter, in such way as to keep up a living structure."—*Bain*, *Senses and Intellect*, p. 65.

This assertion is not that of a physicist, but is from the professor of logic and metaphysics at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. Professor Bain is one of the recognized purveyors of the "metaphysics" of what Professor Tyndall and others call "*the new philosophy.*" When Professor Bain speaks from the metaphysical side, the other members keep a respectful silence. In the loose assertion quoted it is not a "correlation" of physical forces that is referred to, but is something infinitely below that. It is a mere "collocation" or group. We know we ought not to say what we are about to, but we must. The looseness the above quotation exhibits runs through all Professor Bain's philosophical writings from beginning to end. Valuable as they are on many accounts, there is still that vagueness and looseness in thought, and therefore in statement, taken as a

whole, that often almost defies definite understanding, and baffles any ordinary attempt at a settled critical estimate of his labors. There is absolutely no real warrant for this carelessly confident assertion.

"In its primary stage every germ consists of a substance that is uniform throughout both in texture and composition."—*Spencer*, *First Princ.*, p. 148. Or, again, "Take a mass of unorganized, but organizable matter—either the body of the lowest living form, or the germ of a higher one."—*Ibid.*, p. 370. These are not merely assertions without proof, but against it. Will any competent physiologist agree that the germ of any "higher" animal is "uniform throughout both in texture and composition?" Is there such a thing as a "germ" without a "cell?" Is a cell "uniform throughout in texture and composition?" Will any one affirm this? No good physiologist will. But Mr. Spencer does. No statement at all pertinent could be further from the truth. However ingenious, inventive, and bold as a thinker, or keen in analysis, or close as a reasoner, *when premises are given*, Mr. Spencer may be, we feel bound to remark that the looseness in the premises manifest in the passages just quoted is almost a characteristic of his writings. A signal example of this will soon be introduced.

"The contractility of the muscles, and the irritability of the nerves, are purely the result of the molecular mechanism of those organs."—*Huxley*, *Lay Ser.*, p. 334. It would not be so bad a mistake to say that the running of a watch is purely the result of "its mechanism." In such a statement you would omit all reference to the person who winds the watch. Instead of saying "it is purely," we should say, "partly the result." "The will is a power that excites nerve force in the brain, which again excites mechanical power in the muscles. Will power is therefore correlated with nerve power, in the same manner as the latter is with muscular power."—*Youmans*, *Introduct. Con. and Cor. of Forces*, p. 32. On this assertion we remark, *first*, that it is said nerve power "excites" muscular power, therefore they are "correlated." Suppose the first part of this statement to be true—and we believe it is—does the latter part follow as a consequence? Professor Youmans says it does. But his statement on this point is a mere assertion. Does the fact that nerve power "excites" muscular power prove that they whole, that often almost defies definite understanding, and baffles any ordinary attempt at a sound critical estimate of his labors. There is absolutely no real warrant for this exceedingly confident assertion.

"In its primary stage every germ consists of a substance that is uniform throughout both in texture and composition."—*Spencer, First Princ.*, p. 148. Or, again, "Take a mass of unorganized, but organizable matter—either the body of the lowest living form, or the germ of a higher one."—*Ibid.*, p. 370. These are not merely assertions without proof, but against it. Will any competent physiologist agree that the germ of any "higher" animal is "uniform throughout both in texture and composition?" Is there such a thing as a "germ" without a "cell?" Is a cell "uniform throughout in texture and composition?" Will any one affirm this? No good physiologist will. But Mr. Spencer does. No statement at all pertinent could be further from the truth. However ingenious, inventive, and bold as a thinker, or keen in analysis, or close as a reasoner, when premises are given, Mr. Spencer may be, we feel bound to remark that the looseness in the premises manifest in the passages just quoted is almost a characteristic of his writings. A signal example of this will soon be introduced.

"The contractility of the muscles, and the irritability of the nerves, are purely the result of the molecular mechanism of those organs."—*Huxley, Lay Ser.*, p. 324. It would not be so bad a mistake to say that the running of a watch is purely the result of "its mechanism." In such a statement you would omit all reference to the person who winds the watch. Instead of saying "it is purely," we should say, "partly the result."

"The will is a power that excites nerve force in the brain, which again excites mechanical power in the muscles. Will power is therefore correlated with nerve power, in the same sense as the latter is with muscular power."—Youmans, *Introd. to Con. and Cor. of Forces*, p. 32. On this assertion we remark—*first*, that it is said nerve power "excites" muscular power, therefore they are "correlated." Suppose the first part of this statement to be true—and we believe it is—does the latter part follow as a consequence! Professor Youmans says it does. But his statement on this point is a mere assertion. Does the fact that nerve power "excites" muscular power prove that they are correlated? Does the word *excite* mean to *convert?* One force rouses or excites another force to action. Does this even suggest *conversion?* Yet this is all Professor Youmans's case amounts to. *Second.* But if this be so, what force has the expression "in the same manner," which is intended to transfer the presumption gained on one side to the other? But if it is not proved that nerve and muscular forces are correlated, then it is not proved that will power and nerve force are—since this case borrows from that its title to favor. Besides this, as we have already seen, though it might be shown that nerve and muscular forces are mutually convertible, even a presumption could not be gained in this way in favor of the conversion of nerve force into will force, unless it can be shown, as it never has been, that nerve force is vital force.

Again, "Vitality would not then be a special principle, but a result, and would be explained ultimately by the operation of molecular forces."—*Maudsley, Body and Mind.* This is simply the reiteration of an assertion, made in almost numberless ways, that "vitality" or vital force is a mere compound or collocation of physical forces. But we have already seen on what kind of real foundation such assertions rest. While the conclusion is thrust prominently forward and used as if it was a real *datum*, we are told its premises will be ultimately produced. Until they are produced, what have we besides mere assertion?

Again, "The plant apparently seizes the combined carbon and oxygen, tears them asunder, storing up the carbon and letting the oxygen go free. By no special force different from other forces (physical forces) do plants exercise this power—the real magician is the sun!"—*Heat as a Mode of Motion*, p. 445. Here a qualitative equality is asserted as between the assimilative force of plants and physical and chemical forces. But what foundation have such confident assertions? The proof of this is, that "without the sun the reduction [of carbonic acid] cannot take place." Of course. But what is this more than to say, that without the spark there could have been no explosion? But we shall soon meet with another statement from Professor Tyndall, the bare mention of which will render any further examination of this unnecessary.

In like manner we might fill page after page with mere are correlated? Does the word *excite* mean to *convert?* One force rouses or excites another force to action. Does this even suggest conversion? Yet this is all Professor Youmans's case amounts to. *Second.* But if this be so, what force has the expression "in the same manner," which is intended to transfer the presumption gained on one side to the other? But if it is not proved that nerve and muscular forces are correlated, then it is not proved that will power and nerve force are—since this case borrows from that its title to favor. Besides this, as we have already seen, though it might be shown that nerve and muscular forces are mutually convertible, even a presumption could not be gained in this way in favor of the conversion of nerve force into will force, unless it can be shown, as it never has been, that nerve force is vital force.

Again, "Vitality would not then be a special principle, but a result, and would be explained ultimately by the operation of molecular forces."—*Maudsley, Body and Mind.* This is simply the reiteration of an assertion, made in almost numberless ways, that "vitality" or vital force is a mere compound or collocation of physical forces. But we have already seen on what kind of real foundation such assertions rest. While the conclusion is thrust prominently forward and used as if it was a real datum, we are told its premises will be ultimately produced. Until they are produced, what have we besides mere assertion?

Again, "The plant apparently seizes the combined carbon and oxygen, tears them asunder, storing up the carbon and letting the oxygen go free. By no special force different from other forces (physical forces) do plants exercise this power—the real magician is the sun!"—*Heat as a Mode of Motion*, p. 445. Here a qualitative equality is assumed as between the assimilative force of plants and physical and chemical forces. But what foundation have such confident assertions? The proof of this is, that "without the sun the reduction [of carbonic acid] cannot take place." Of course. But what is this more than to say, that without the spark there could have been no explosion? But we shall soon meet with another statement from Professor Tyndall, the bare mention of which will render any further examination of this unnecessary.

In like manner we might fill page after page with mere assertions, in which the comment would have to be "highly important, if true," but which, in most cases, would be found destitute of any real foundation. But alongside of the assertions, specimens of which have been quoted, it is but fair to state that most of the men who have made them have admitted, directly or indirectly, the proof of the correlation of physical, vital, and mental forces is not so clear and satisfactory after all. It is with most, at times,' pretty much as it is with Professor Huxley when he says: "I hold, with the materialist, that the human body, like all living bodies, is a machine, all the operations of which will sooner or later be explained on physical principles." It has not yet been done, but will be some day. The difficulty of the case is conceded or expressed in numberless passages like the following:

> Knowledge cannot pass the life boundary.—*Maudsley.* Subtle influences.—*Huxley.* Under sundry circumstances.—*Ibid.* Mysterious agency.—*Barker.* Suppose a case, [and then following this, and depending on it:] Now an evident corollary from this conclusion or formula, etc.—*Spencer.* Singular inward laboratory.—*Huxley.* We may hope that future investigations will throw more light on this subject.—*Büchner.* We doubt not. Chemistry doubts not her ability. We may still hope. It may be expected. Future investigations will decide. Might at some period have commenced. Presupposing a first organic, etc. We can only imagine. Happened under unusual conditions. Chemistry has not succeeded in forming a *blastema*, nor physics in forming a cell.—*Virchow.* May some day, etc.—*Virchow.* Natural effects as yet unknown to us in their relations.—*Büchner.* With all our knowledge we skim only at the surface of life.—*Ibid.* Life in its inmost relations is certainly a book with seven seals—riddle upon riddle.—*Ibid.* I believe that we shall sooner or later arrive at a mechanical equivalent of consciousness, just as we have arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat.—*Huxley, Lay Sermons,* p. 339.

He believes it. If so, he believes on evidence. "Belief," says Professor Huxley, "in the scientific sense of the word, is a serious matter, and needs strong foundations. . . . But expectation is permissible where belief is not." Now, what are the "strong foundations" on which the "scientific" belief, above avowed, rests? If we are not mistaken, we have succeeded in showing, that so far from such "belief" having "strong foundations," there is no real foundation whatever.

assertions, in which the argument would have to be "mainly important, if true," but which, in most cases, would be found destitute of any real foundation. But alongside of the assertions, specimens of which have been quoted, it is but fair to state that most of the men who have made them have admitted, directly or indirectly, the proof of the correlation of physical, vital, and mental forces is not so clear and satisfactory after all. It is with most, at times, pretty much as it is with Professor Huxley when he says: "I hold, with the materialist, that the human body, like all living bodies, is a machine, all the operations of which will sooner or later be explained on physical principles." It has not yet been done, but will be some day. The difficulty of the case is conceded or expressed in numberless passages like the following:

Knowledge cannot pass the life boundary.—*Maudsley.* Subtle influences.—*Huxley.* Under worthy circumstances.—*Ibid.* Mysterious agency.—*Brewer.* Suppose a case, [and then following this, and depending on it;] Now an evident corollary from this conclusion or formula, etc.—*Spencer.* Singular unusual laboratory.—*Huxley.* We may hope that future investigations will throw some light on this subject.—*Gardner.* We doubt not. Chemistry doubts not her ability. We may still hope. It may be expected. Future investigations will decide. Might at some period have commenced. Presupposing a first organic, etc. We can only imagine. Happened under unusual conditions. Chemistry has not succeeded in forming a *blastema*, nor physics in forming a cell.—*Virchow.* May some day, etc.—*Virchow.* Natural affects as yet unknown to us in their relations.—*Büchner.* With all our knowledge we skim only at the surface of life.—*Ibid.* Life in its inmost relations is certainly a book with seven seals—riddle upon riddle.—*Ibid.* "I believe that we shall sooner or later arrive at a mechanical equivalent of consciousness, just as we have arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat.—*Huxley, Lay Sermons*, p. 339.

He believes it. If so, he believes on evidence. "Belief," says Professor Huxley, "in the scientific sense of the word, is a serious matter, and needs strong foundations. . . . But expectation is permissible where belief is not." Now, what are the "strong foundations" on which the "scientific" belief, above avowed, rests? If we are not mistaken, we have succeeded in showing, that so far from such "belief" having "strong foundations," there is no real foundation whatever.

The cases we are about to cite might have been placed under the head of analogies, but they better deserve the place we have made for them. We class them under the head of *imaginary analogies*—not real ones—or, better still, as *imaginings.*

The first case shall be from Mr. Spencer's "Psychology," in his chapter on the Genesis of Nerves. This case is not taken because it is the only one his writings furnish. We really had some difficulty in deciding as between this and other cases as to which we should take. But let the reader give attention to the following account of the formation of nerves.

Says this ingenious writer:

> When through *undifferentiated tissue* there has passed for the first time a wave of disturbance from *some* place where molecular motion is liberated, to *some* place where it is absorbed, the line of least resistance followed must be an indefinite and irregular one. *Fully to understand the genesis of nerves* we must understand the physical actions which change this vague course into a definite channel, that becomes ever more permeable as it is more used. . . . To aid our conceptions we will, as before, take the rude analogy furnished by a row of bricks on end, which overthrow one another in succession. *If* such bricks on end have been adjusted so that their faces are all at right angles to the line of the series, the change will be propagated along them with the least hinderance, or, under certain conditions, with the greatest multiplication of the original impulse. For when so placed the impact each brick gives to the next, being exactly in the line of the series, will be wholly effective, but when they are otherwise placed it will not. *If* the bricks stand with their faces variously askew, each in falling will have a motion more or less diverging from the line of the series; and hence, only a part of its momentum will impel the next in the required direction. Now, though in the case of a series of molecules, the action can be by no means so simple, *yet the same principle holds.* The isomeric change of a molecule must diffuse a wave which is greater in some one direction than all others. *If* so, there are certain relative positions of molecules, such that each will receive the greatest amount of this wave from its predecessor, and will so receive it as most readily to produce a like change in itself. A series of molecules thus placed must stand in symmetrical relations to one another—polar relations—as it is not difficult to see that, as in the case of the bricks, any deviation from symmetrical or polar relations will involve a proportionate deduction from the efficiency of the shock, and a diminution in the quantity of the molecular motion given out at the far end. But now, what is the indirect result when a

The cases we are about to cite might have been placed under the head of analogies, but they better deserve the place we have made for them. We class them under the head of *imaginary analogies*—not real ones,—or, better still, as *imaginaries*.

The first case shall be from Mr. Spencer's "Psychology," in his chapter on the Genesis of Nerves. This case is not taken because it is the only one his writings furnish. We really had some difficulty in deciding as between this and other cases as to which we should take. But let the reader give attention to the following account of the formation of nerves.

Says this ingenious writer:

> *When* through undifferentiated tissue there has passed for the first time a wave of disturbance from some place where molecular motion is liberated, to some place where it is absorbed, the line of least resistance followed must be an indefinite and irregular one. *Fully to understand the genesis of nerves we must understand* the physical actions which change this vague course into a definite channel, that becomes ever more permeable as it is more used. . . . To aid our conceptions we will, as before, take the rude analogy furnished by a row of bricks on end, which overthrow one another in succession. *If* such bricks on end have been adjusted so that their faces are all at right angles to the line of the series, the change will be propagated along them with the least hinderance, or, under certain conditions, with the greatest multiplication of the original impulse. For when so placed the impact each brick gives to the next, being exactly in the line of the series, will be wholly effective, but when they are otherwise placed it will not. *If* the bricks stand with their faces variously askew, each in falling will have a motion more or less diverging from the line of the series; and hence, only a part of its momentum will impel the next in the required direction. *Now, though in* the case of a series of molecules, the action can be by no means so simple, *yet the same principle holds*. The isomeric change of a molecule must diffuse a wave which is greater in some one direction than all others. *If so*, there are certain relative positions of molecules, such that each will receive the greatest amount of this wave from its predecessor, and will so receive it as most readily to produce a like change in itself. *A series of molecules thus placed must stand in symmetrical relations to one another—polar relations*—as it is not difficult to see that, as in the case of the bricks, any deviation from symmetrical or polar relations will involve a proportionate deduction from the efficiency of the shock, and a diminution in the quantity of the molecular motion given out at the far end. *But now, what is the indirect result when a*

wave of change passes along a line of molecules thus unsymmetrically placed? The indirect result is, that the motion which is not passed on by the unsymmetrically arranged molecules, goes toward placing them symmetrically. Let us again consider what happens with our row of bricks. When one of these in falling comes against the next standing askew, its impact is given to the nearest angle of this next, and tends to give this next a motion round its axis. Farther, when the next thus moved delivers its motion to its successor, it does this not through the angle on the side that was struck, but through the diagonally opposite angle, and, consequently, the reaction of its impact on its successor adds to the rotary motion already received. Hence the amount of force which it does not pass on, is the amount of force absorbed in turning it toward parallelism with its neighbors. *Similarly with the molecules.* Each in falling into its *isomeric attitude*, and passing on the shock to its successor, stands in polar relation toward it, but which, *if* the relation is not polar, is only partially passed on—some of it being taken up in moving the successor toward polar relation. One more *consequence* is to be observed. Every approach of the molecular toward symmetrical arrangement increases the amount of molecular motion transferred from one end of the series to the other. *Suppose* that the row of bricks, which were at first very much out of parallelism, have fallen, and that part of the motion given by each to the next has gone toward bringing their faces nearer to parallelism; and *suppose*, that without further changing their positions of bases, the bricks are severally restored to their vertical attitudes, then it will happen that *if* the serial overthrow of them is repeated, the actions, though the same as before in their kind, will not be the same as before in their degrees. Each brick, falling as it now does more in the line of the series, will deliver more of its momentum to the next, and less momentum will be taken up in moving the next toward parallelism with its neighbors. *If, then, the analogy holds*, it must happen that in the series of isomerically changing molecules, each transmitted wave of molecular motion is expended, partly in so altering the molecular attitude so as to render the series more permeable to future waves, and partly in setting up changes at the end of the series; that in proportion as less of it is absorbed in working this structural change, more of it is delivered at the far end, and greater effect produced there; and that the final state is one in which the initial wave of molecular motion is transmitted without deduction, or rather without the addition of the molecular motion given out by the successive molecules of the series in their isomeric falls.

From beginning to end, *therefore, the development of nerve results from the passage of motion along the line of least resistance*, and the reduction of it to a line of less and less resistance continually. The first opening of a route along which equilibrium is restored between a place where molecular motion is in excess and a place where it is in defect, comes within this *formula*. The

production of a more continuous line of that peculiar "*colloid*" best fitted to transmit the molecular motion also comes within this *formula*, as does likewise the making of this line thicker and more even. And the *formula* also covers that final process by which the line, having been formed, has its molecules brought into the polar order which least resists, and indeed facilitates, the transmission of the wave. . . . Each approach toward an attitude of equilibrium is a change toward diminished resistance; and so on, until there are simultaneously reached the state of structural equilibrium and no resistance. Carrying with us these conceptions, we now pass from the genesis of nerves to the genesis of nervous systems.—*Paragraphs* 224, 225.

We may remark that the account of the genesis of nervous systems is equally luminous and satisfactory. After you leave his chapters on the "unknowable" in his "*First Principles*," Mr. Spencer's mode of proceeding through *biology* and *psychology* is fairly represented by this extract. When soberly regarded, can any one say they have ever met with a more fanciful, or artificial, or minute account of a process, the details of which are mostly beyond the power of the microscope, and of which, for this reason as well as for others, we know almost nothing? Mr. Spencer has no trouble whatever in furnishing himself with an obedient "colloid." He then *assumes* imaginary motions springing up here and there, apart from any apparent cause, and then directs these imaginary "motions" along purely imaginary "lines of least resistance," knocking down imaginary "rows of bricks," "askew" and otherwise, or anywise, and picking these "bricks" up again and again, and as often knocking them down until they cease to be "askew," and then ends with them, whether down or up we know not. But at this point "bricks" and "molecules" disappear in their "lines" and "series," and, a path having been established in his "colloid," a nerve emerges, as from a dissolving view, as the highway of "*motions*," nervous and mental, for the future.

Mr. Spencer is a believer in the "correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces," and, moreover, is a believer in the doctrine of evolution "from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous," from the "simple chemical elements" to the "colloid," and from the "colloid" to all "differentiated" tissues of the animal body—from the simple "chemical and physical forces" up to "life," and from "life" to "mind." In these two parallel series the terms are so related that the one above production of a more continuous line of that peculiar "colloid" best fitted to transmit the molecular motion also comes within this *formula*, as does likewise the making of this line thicker and more even. And the *formula* also covers that final process by which the line, having been formed, has its molecules brought into the polar order which least resists, and indeed facilitates, the transmission of the waves. . . . Each approach toward an extreme of equilibrium is a change toward diminished resistance; and so on, until there are simultaneously reached the state of structural equilibrium and no resistance. Carrying with us these conceptions, we now pass from the genesis of nerves to the genesis of nervous systems.—*Paragraphs* 224, 225.

We may remark that the account of the genesis of nervous systems is equally luminous and satisfactory. After you leave his chapters on the "unknowable" in his "*First Principles*," Mr. Spencer's mode of proceeding through *biology* and *psychology* is fairly represented by this extract. When soberly regarded, can any one say they have ever met with a more fanciful, or artificial, or minute account of a process, the details of which are mostly beyond the power of the microscope, and of which, for this reason as well as for others, we know almost nothing? Mr. Spencer has no trouble whatever in furnishing himself with an obedient "colloid." He then assumes imaginary motions springing up here and there, apart from any apparent cause, and then directs these imaginary "motions" along purely imaginary "lines of least resistance," knocking down imaginary "rows of bricks," "askew" and otherwise, or anywise, and picking these "bricks" up again and again, and as often knocking them down until they cease to be "askew," and then ends with them, whether down or up we know not. But at this point "bricks" and "molecules" disappear in their "lines" and "series," and, a path having been established in his "colloid," a nerve emerges, as from a dissolving view, as the highway of "motions," nervous and mental, for the future.

Mr. Spencer is a believer in the "correlation of the physical, vital, and mental forces," and, moreover, is a believer in the doctrine of evolution "from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous," from the "simple chemical elements" to the "colloid," and from the "colloid" to all "differentiated" tissues of the animal body—from the simple "chemical and physical forces" up to "life," and from "life" to "mind." In these two parallel series the terms are so related that the one above is wholly derived from the one next below. The two series would read thus:

1. Simple elements = colloid = organism.
2. Simple forces = vitality = mind.

Mr. Spencer begins with his "series of bricks" as a "possible analogy." Doubtful at first, he waxes bolder as he proceeds. He soon slips over from "bricks" to "molecules," "knocks" his "molecules" about as easily as his "bricks," and soon calls his "possible analogy" by the strict and dignified name "*formula*," and begins to deduce "*consequences*" and "*corollaries*," attains an equilibrium, and emerges complacently with a specimen of "nerve," saying, "We now pass from the genesis of nerves to the genesis of nervous systems." And this is the scientific way in which, in Mr. Spencer's hands, "physical and chemical forces," "colloids," "motions," "lines of least resistance," etc., being *given*, do the work of the supposed "vital forces." And this is the showing of a master in the school to which he belongs.

Before ten years shall pass, we predict of Mr. Spencer's "*First Principles*," "*Biology*," and "*Psychology*," that instead of occupying the place some have claimed for them, they will be regarded by most as mere curiosities in respect to much that is peculiar to himself in them. But Mr. Spencer does not stand alone in using his imagination in science. All do not use "rows of bricks," but vary the figure to suit personal taste or convenience. For example, we have "cell laboratories," "molecular machinery," etc. Now for a moment suppose there is something that may be compared to a laboratory, what of it? A skillful chemist (a tyro or ignoramus will not do) enters a highly and minutely furnished laboratory, filled with all the appliances of that science which has done so much in the past, and some of whose votaries entertain for it such extravagant expectations for the future, and he emerges after a bewildering series of experiments, with two or three specimens of "organic matter" which stand at the very bottom of the list, such as *urea*. Now, in regard to the *urea*, did the vaunted chemical and "physical forces" make it of themselves, as they are asserted in innumerable other instances to have done, or did the learned and intelligent chemist make it,

using his "machinery?" Did any chemist ever have the happiness to sit down in his laboratory, and, like another Aladdin, by rubbing his retort, see these wonder-working "forces of nature" perform any, even of his more humble, work? If the chemist must coax and compel in his laboratory, who does the business in question in that "cell laboratory" where molecular changes take place by "subtle influences," or by "mysterious agents," under "peculiar circumstances," in "certain conditions," all by invisible "molecular machinery?"

How is it these forces conspire to come together, and do within the limits of a microscopic cell what the chemist is not able to do in his "cell;" and that, too, without any help, or guidance, or machinery, transcending all the calculations, ponderings, devices, and experiments of a Dumas, a Liebig, a Wöhler, a Graham, a Miller, etc.? The chemist and physicist goes on and "imagines" a "cell laboratory," then he imagines "machinery," being influenced by the spell of his own chamber; but there is just one more step forward in the imaginative process none of these gentlemen have dared to take—that is, to imagine a *chemist* in the cell, master of its "machinery" and processes.

But let us return to our "imaginative" work. With the "cell laboratory" fitted .up with "cell machinery," no matter how we come by it, heat steps in, we will say, and, finding nobody at home, all ready, "swept and garnished," steam is soon up, and the "cell machinery" grinds away at a grist of oxygen and carbon, water and ammonia, and, as a "result," "evolves" protoplasm, the same machinery spinning its own fibers or molding its own matter into cells or into molecular "bricks," to be set up "askew" and knocked down again, until a "structural equilibrium" is reached, and "motion," the shadow of force, dances along the "lines of least resistance," laying the silver cords, and brightens finally into mind. Was there ever a purer piece of imagination than this? Can you pick up any fairy tale or mythologic bit lighter of wing than this? Talk hereafter about imagination having no place in science when its apostles breathe so freely its divine air! Just listen now to Professor Tyndall in the closing passage of his "*Heat as a Mode of Motion*," and as the *sun* speaks in him, distinguish between the truth and beauty of the thought:

> This is a representative case. Every tree, plant, and flower grows and flourishes by the grace and bounty of the sun. But we cannot stop at vegetable life, for this is the source, mediate or immediate, of all animal life. In the animal body vegetable substances are brought again into contact with their beloved oxygen, and they burn within us as a fire burns within a grate. This is the source of all animal power, and the forces in play are the same in kind as those which operate in organic nature. In the plant the clock is wound up, in the animal it runs down. In the plant the atoms are separated, in the animal they combine. *And as surely as the force which moves a clock's hands is derived from the hand which winds up the clock, so surely is all terrestrial power drawn from the sun.* Leaving out of the account the eruptions of volcanoes, and the ebb and flow of the tides, *every* mechanical action on the earth's surface, *every* manifestation of power, *organic and inorganic, vital and physical, is produced by the sun. . . . And remember, this is not poetry, but rigid mechanical truth. He* rears, as I have said, the whole vegetable world, and through it the animal, [new edition of the Psalms;] the lilies of the field are his workmanship, the verdure of the meadows and the cattle upon a thousand hills. *He* forms the muscle, *he* urges the blood, *he* builds the brain. *His* fleetness is in the lion's foot, *he* springs in the panther, *he* soars in the eagle, *he* slides in the snake. *He* builds the forest and *hews it down*, the *power which raised the tree and wields the ax being one and the same.* The clover sprouts and blossoms, and the scythe of the mower swings by the *same force.* The *sun* digs the ore from our mines, *he* rolls the iron, *he* rivets the plates, *he* boils the water, *he* draws the trains. *He* not only grows the cotton, but he spins the fiber and weaves the web. There is not a hammer raised, a wheel turned, a shuttle thrown, that is not raised and turned and thrown by the *sun.* His energy is poured freely into space, but our world is a halting-place, where his energy is conditioned. Here the Proteus works his spells, the self-same essence takes a million shapes and hues, and finally dissolves into its primitive and almost formless form. The sun comes to us as heat, he quits us as heat, and between his entrance and departure the multiform powers of our globe appear. They are *all* special forms of solar power, the molds into which his strength is temporarily poured in passing from its source through infinitude.—Page 446.

And "this is not poetry, but rigid mechanical truth." Where "rigid mechanical truth" is so much "stranger than airy fiction," we are wholly prepared to believe that "the natural philosopher of to-day may dwell amid conceptions which beggar those of Milton." After what has been already said, it is useless to comment on this passage, which is as conspicuous for its want of truth as for its beauty. Until now we

This is a representative case. Every tree, plant, and flower grows and flourishes by the grace and bounty of the sun. But we cannot stop at vegetable life, for this is the source, mediate or immediate, of all animal life. In the animal body vegetable substances are brought again into contact with their beloved oxygen, and they burn within us as a fire burns within a grate. This is the source of all animal power; and the forces in play are the same in kind as those which operate in organic nature. In the plant the clock is wound up, in the animal it runs down. In the plant the atoms are separated, in the animal they combine. And as surely *as the force which moves a clock's hands is derived from the hand which winds up the clock, so surely is all terrestrial power drawn from the sun.* Leaving out of the account the eruptions of volcanoes, and the ebb and flow of the tides, every mechanical action on the earth's surface, every manifestation of power, organic and *inorganic, vital and physical, is produced by the sun.* . . . *And remember, this is not poetry, but rigid mechanical truth. He* rears, as I have said, the whole vegetable world, and through it the animal; [new edition of the Psalms;] the lilies of the field are his workmanship, the verdure of the meadows and the cattle upon a thousand hills. *He* forms the muscle, *he* urges the blood, *he* builds the brain. *His* fleetness is in the lion's foot, *he* springs in the panther, *he* soars in the eagle, *he* slides in the snake. *He* builds the forest and hews it down, *the power which raised the tree and wields the axe being one and the same.* The clover sprouts and blossoms, and the scythe of the mower swings by the same *force.* The sun digs the ore from our mines, *he* rolls the iron, *he* rivets the plates, *he* boils the water, *he* draws the trains. *He* not only grows the cotton, but *he* spins the fibre and weaves the web. There is not a hammer raised, a wheel turned, a shuttle thrown, that is not raised and turned and thrown by the sun. His energy is poured freely into space, but our world is a halting-place, where this energy is conditioned. Here the Proteus works his spells; the self-same essence takes a million shapes and hues, and finally dissolves into its primitive and almost formless form. The sun comes to us as heat; he quits us as heat; and between his entrance and departure the multiform powers of our globe appear. They are *all* special forms of solar power, the moulds into which his strength is temporarily poured in passing from its source through infinitude. — Page 449.

And "this is not poetry, but rigid mechanical truth." Where "rigid mechanical truth" is so much "stranger than airy fiction," we are wholly prepared to believe that "the natural philosopher of to-day may dwell amid conceptions which beggar those of Milton." After what has been already said, it is useless to comment on this passage, which is as conspicuous for its want of truth as for its beauty. Until one of did not so much as imagine the sun could think such a passage. But "as surely as the force which moves a clock's hands is derived from the arm which winds up the clock," so surely was it the sun that uttered this rhapsody in its own praise. But this is "rigid mechanical truth." If this is so, what would the scientific "imagination" or its sportive fancy do if it did not restrain itself?

This shall end our review of "evidence" as to the truth of the doctrine that the physical, vital, and mental forces are "correlated." Incidentally, also, we have said negatively all we have the space to say in regard to the *origin* of forces. Positive statements as regards the correlation and origin of forces must be postponed until another occasion. But we have seen, during the preceding examination, no reason for entertaining the notion, now quite common among physicists, that the higher forces are derived from the lower by a species of evolution. This view we believe to be a direct misreading of the whole case. Neither is there any evidence worthy the name that can fairly justify the belief which many have, that the physical, vital, and mental forces are correlated in the same manner as the physical and chemical forces are among themselves. The course of our reasoning thus far would seem to leave to us two other alternatives. They are,

First, That the physical, vital, and mental forces are radically distinct; that there are different kinds of force.

Second, That they all have one common origin or source, and that source, instead of being *physical*, is *mental*, in mind or will.

To fully state both these alternatives, and decide in view of all pertinent facts which may be received of either, may be the subject of another article. Thus far the simple object has been to examine the evidence on which the modern doctrines of the physical origin of vital and mental forces have been reposed.

did not so much as imagine the sun could think such a passage. But "as surely as the force which moves a clock's hands is derived from the arm which winds up the clock," so surely was it the sun that uttered this rhapsody in its own praise. But this is "rigid mechanical truth." If this is so, what would the scientific "imagination" or its speculative fancy do if it did not restrain itself?

This shall end our review of "evidence" as to the truth of the doctrine that the physical, vital, and mental forces are "correlated." Incidentally, also, we have said negatively all we have the space to say in regard to the origin of forces. Positive statements as regards the correlation and origin of forces must be postponed until another occasion. But we have seen, during the preceding examination, no reason for entertaining the notion, now quite common among physicists, that the higher forces are derived from the lower by a species of evolution. This view we believe to be a direct unsettling of the whole case. Neither is there any evidence worthy the name that can fairly justify the belief which many have, that the physical, vital, and mental forces are correlated in the same manner as the physical and chemical forces are among themselves. The course of our reasoning thus far would seem to leave to us two other alternatives. They are,

First, That the physical, vital, and mental forces are radically distinct; that there are different kinds of force.

Second, That they all have one common origin or source, and that source, instead of being physical, is mental, is mind or will.

To fully state both these alternatives, and decide in view of all pertinent facts which may be received of either, may be the subject of another article. Thus far the simple object has been to examine the evidence on which the modern doctrines of the physical origin of vital and mental forces have been reposed.

ART. V.—IS GOD COGNIZABLE BY REASON?

Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or, the Relations between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece and the Positive Teaching of Christ and his Apostles. By B. F. COCKER, D.D., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

THE work of Dr. Cocker is, in effect, a brave defense of the fundamental truths of Christianity. It is a grammar of religious thought, illustrated by citations from Grecian thinkers. It is an attempt to introduce to personal consciousness the axioms of religious philosophy, and familiarize it with their characteristics and implications. But the method is not alone abstract. The necessary laws and tendencies of human thought are illustrated by the history of Greek philosophy; and the necessary relation of all correct thinking to a correct conception of the Christian system is also exemplified in the gradual preparation of the philosophic mind of Greece for the reception of ideas peculiarly Christian.

The work consists, essentially, of three parts: 1. *The fundamental ideas of religious philosophy.* 2. *Illustration of these in the results of Grecian speculation.* 3. *Christian revelation a final disclosure divinely correlated to the religious instincts of man and the previous education of the race.* Such, at least, if not the strict arrangement of the work, is a classification of its ideas, of which we now proceed to give a condensed statement.

In the preliminary chapter the author passes in review the city and the men of Athens, and the physical features of the Grecian peninsula in general. In commenting upon the connection between national character and physical surroundings, he takes occasion to remark that the latter are merely *modifying* forces; while human spontaneity—reason and will—in connection with a superintending Providence, are the fundamental forces which give direction to national development. Human will impresses even the face of nature;* and, though great men are generally mere mouth-pieces of their generation,

---

* On the "Power of Mind over Nature," see Cocker, in "Methodist Quarterly Review," January and April, 1870; and on human will as an original spontaneous cause, see "Whedon on the Will," page 42, and elsewhere; also Cocker in "Methodist Quarterly Review," Oct., 1864.

Art. V.—IS GOD COGNIZABLE BY REASON?

Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or the Relations between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece and the Positive Teaching of Christ and his Apostles. By B. F. Cocker, D.D., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The work of Dr. Cocker is, in effect, a brave defense of the fundamental truths of Christianity. It is a grammar of religious thought, illustrated by citations from Grecian thinkers. It is an attempt to introduce to personal consciousness the axioms of religious philosophy, and familiarize it with their characteristics and implications. But the method is not alone abstract. The necessary laws and tendencies of human thought are illustrated by the history of Greek philosophy; and the necessary relation of all correct thinking to a correct conception of the Christian system is also exemplified in the gradual preparation of the philosophic mind of Greece for the reception of ideas peculiarly Christian.

The work consists, essentially, of three parts: 1. *The fundamental ideas of religious philosophy.* 2. *Illustration of these in the results of Grecian speculation.* 3. *Christian revelation a final disclosure divinely correlated to the religious instincts of man and the previous education of the race.* Such, at least, if not the strict arrangement of the work, is a classification of its ideas, of which we now proceed to give a condensed statement.

In the preliminary chapter the author passes in review the city and the men of Athens, and the physical features of the Grecian peninsula in general. In commenting upon the connection between national character and physical surroundings he takes occasion to remark that the latter are merely conditioning forces; while human spontaneity—reason and will—in connection with a superintending Providence, are the fundamental forces which give direction to national development. Human will impresses even the face of nature;* and, though great men are generally more mouth-pieces of their generation they seem sometimes appointed by Divine Providence to antagonize the spirit of their age, and achieve moral revolutions. Still, physical surroundings impart individuality to national character; and this is well exemplified in the Hellenic traits. The central question of Greece in the civilized world led to a *commercial* development, and this was favored by a maritime climate. The configuration of the surface and the shore line contributed to *individuality;* its scenery impressed the *æsthetic* character. The Athenians were ardent, vivacious, and of independent spirit. Their intellect tended to observation and thought, and their language was adapted to be the vehicle of the highest philosophy, and the medium of the loftiest civilization attainable without Christianity.

---

* On the "Power of Mind over Nature," see Cocker in "Methodist Quarterly Review," January and April, 1870; and on human will as an overall influence, see "Wisdom of the Will," page 42, and elsewhere; also Cocker in "Methodist Quarterly Review," Oct., 1864.

Before proceeding to discuss the religion of the Athenians, our author furnishes a condensed and masterly exhibit of the philosophy of religion in general. Defining religion as "a form of thought, feeling, and action which has the *Divine* for its object, basis, and end," and enunciating the fact of history and ethnology, that "religious ideas and sentiments have prevailed among all nations," he runs his scalpel through the joints of the various theories of religious phenomena which do not recognize their germs in the constitution of the human mind. This chapter, by itself, is a neat, clean-cut monograph, and might well be made a tract for more general reading. The Comtean theory *that religious phenomena have arisen from the fear of unseen powers*, falls with the overthrow of Comte's theory of the "law of the three states" in human development—the "theological," the "metaphysical," and the positive."[*] The Hegelian theory that *religion is a part of an evolution of the Absolute, attaining its fullest self-consciousness in philosophy*, next receives an exposition (if exposition be possible) and an exposure[†]—for propositions which categorically contradict the axioms of reason[‡] admit only of exposure, and they seem sometimes appointed by Divine Providence to organize the spirit of their age, and achieve moral conquests. Still, physical surroundings impart, inevitably, a national character; and this is well exemplified in the Hellenic type. The central position of Greece in the civilized world fitted it for a commercial development; and this was favored by a genial climate. The configuration of the surface and the shore line contributed to independency; its scenery impressed the artistic character. The Athenians were ardent, vivacious, and of independent spirit. Their intellect tended to observation and thought, and their language was adapted to be the vehicle of the highest philosophy, and the medium of the loftiest civilization attainable without Christianity.

---

[*] Pages 57–65. See also a sharp criticism of this fundamental position in Huxley's "Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews," pp. 156–164; and for a consummate dissection of the "Philosophie Positive," see "Martineau's Essays," vol. i, pp. 1–62.

[†] Pages 65–69.

[‡] Like this: "Being and nothing are identical." The fundamental principle of Hegelianism is the paradox that "contraries are identical." But, since the time of Aristotle, the "law of non-contradiction" has been accepted by all logicians as a fundamental law of thought

Before proceeding to discuss the religion of the Athenians, our author furnishes a condensed and masterly review of the philosophy of religion in general. Defining religion as "a form of thought, feeling, and action which has the Divine for its object, basis, and end," and accumulating the data of history and ethnology, that "religious ideas and sentiments have prevailed among all nations," he runs his scalpel through the joints of the various theories of religious phenomena which do not recognize their germs in the constitution of the human mind. This chapter, by itself, is a most vigorous, thorough, and might well be made a tract for more general reading. The Comtean theory that *religious phenomena have arisen from the fear of unseen powers*, falls with the overthrow of Comte's theory of the "law of the three states" in human development—the "theological," the "metaphysical," and the positive."* The Hegelian theory that *religion is a part of the evolution of the Absolute, attaining its perfect self-consciousness in philosophy*, must receive an exposition (if exposition be possible) and an exposure†—for propositions which categorically contradict the axioms of reason, admit only of exposure, and not of refutation. The theory of Jacobi and Schleiermacher, that *religion has its foundation in feeling* is indefensible, since *feeling* cannot be the source of ideas; and further, any *cognition* of Deity alleged as *correlated* to the feeling of the Divine, must be logically preceded by *ideas of reason*.* The theory of Cousin, that *religion has its outbirth in the spontaneous apperceptions of the reason*, is stated and substantiated as a rational account of the genesis of the *idea of God*, but found defective as a philosophy of the phenomena of religion. (Pp. 78–86.) Finally, the theory that *religious phenomena had their origin in external revelation*, is shown to be unsatisfactory,† because, 1. It is improbable that truths so important should have been intrusted to tradition alone; 2. The theory does not account for the *universality* of religious habits and practices; 3. Verbal revelation could *convey no ideas* to a being destitute of antecedent notions of divine things. (Pp. 86–95.)

---

* Pages 39-65. See also a sharp criticism of the Comtean doctrine in [illegible] "Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews," pp. 162-[illegible]; and [illegible] of the "Philosophie Positive," etc. "Morningside Essays," [illegible] pp. 1-[illegible]

† Pages 55-63.

‡ Like this: "Being and nothing are the same." The fundamental principle of Hegelianism is the paradox that "contraries are identical." But since the time of Aristotle, the "law of non-contradiction" has been accepted by all thinkers as a fundamental law of thought.

As the result of this survey, our author concludes with the following proposition: "The universal phenomenon of religion has originated in the *à priori* apperceptions of reason, and the natural, instinctive feelings of the heart, which from age to age have been vitalized, unfolded, and perfected by supernatural communications and testamentary revelations."—P. 97. It thus contains an element of REASON, an element of FEELING, and an element of REVELATION.

The way is now opened for a statement of the higher characteristics of the religion of the Athenians. Numerous evidences, presented to the eyes of St. Paul as he entered their not of refutation. The theory of Jacobi and Schleiermacher, that *religion has its foundation in feeling* is inadequate, since *feeling* cannot be the source of ideas; and further, any cognitions of Deity alleged as correlated to the feeling of the Divine, must be logically preceded by *ideas of reason*.* The theory of Cousin, that *religion has its outbirth in the spontaneous apperceptions of the reason*, is stated and substantiated as a rational account of the genesis of *the idea of God*, but found defective as a philosophy of the phenomena of religion. (Pp. 78–85.) Finally, the theory that *religious phenomena had their origin in external revelation*, is shown to be unsatisfactory,† because, 1. It is improbable that truths so important should have been intrusted to tradition alone; 2. The theory does not account for the *universality* of religious habits and practices; 3. Verbal revelation could convey no ideas to a being destitute of antecedent notions of divine things. (Pp. 91–95.)

---

* Pages 70–77. Is not this criticism based on a misconception of the sense in which Jacobi employs the term "feeling?" All mental states may be regarded as "feeling." Brown uses "feeling" for consciousness, ("Philosophy of the Human Mind," sect. xi.) All cognition involves a kind of *intellectual feeling*—the subjective factor of consciousness. J. S. Mill uses the term in this sense. "Every thing is a feeling, of which the mind is conscious," ("System of Logic," Am. Ed., p. 34. The *sensus numinis* evidently is not supposed to be a distinct definable cognition, but only the analogue of the *sensus vagus*, or vital sense, in the field of sensations. Jacobi calls it "*Glaube*," and compares it with our "faith" in the intuitions of sense; and, finally, in a later work, (*ueber das Unternehmen des Kriticismus, die Vernunft zu Verstande zu bringen*, 1802,) the faculty which he had before called "Faith," he now named "Reason."—*Vernunft*. This would make the corresponding "feeling" something much more specific than the *sensus vagus*—a real intuition of God.

† On this, see also Cocker in "Methodist Quarterly Review," April, 1862.

As the result of this survey, our author concludes with the following proposition: "The universal phenomenon of religion has originated in the *à priori* apperceptions of reason, and the natural, instinctive feelings of the heart, which from age to age have been vitalized, unfolded, and perfected by supernatural communications and instrumentary revelations."—P. 97. It thus contains an element of REASON, an element of FEELING, and an element of REVELATION.

The way is now opened for a statement of the higher characteristics of the religion of the Athenians. Numerous evidences, presented to the eyes of St. Paul as he entered their city, convinced him that they were "every way more than ordinarily religious."[*] This character the apostle had reason to ascribe to them in a sense entirely strict and legitimate, religion in its essential character being something more than a system of dogmatic teaching, and consisting in "a mode of thought, feeling, and action determined by our consciousness of dependence on a Supreme Being," (p. 107;) the numberless temples and shrines of Athens testified to their excessive "carefulness about religion." Leaving their idolatries and superstitions for the moment in the back-ground, certain noble and normal outcrops of the religious nature were clearly discernable in the religious philosophy of the Athenians. They had some faith in the being and providence of God. (Pp. 107–109.) They felt a consciousness of dependence upon God. (Pp. 110–117.) One of their own poets (Aratus) had said:

---

* Pages 19–77. Is not this criticism based on a misconception of the sense in which Jacobi employs the term "feeling?" All mental states may be regarded as "feeling." Brown uses "feeling" for consciousness, ("Philosophy of the Human Mind," sect. xi.) All cognition involves a kind of individual subjective factor of consciousness. J. S. Mill uses the term in this sense. "Every thing is a feeling, of which the mind is conscious," ("System of Logic," Am. Ed., p. 34. The sense sensible evidently is not supposed to be a distinct cognition, but only the analogue of the sense organ, or what exists in the field of sensations. Jacobi calls it "Glaube," and compares it with our "faith" in the intuitions of sense; and, finally, in a later work, under the [illegible] was sie [illegible] (1822,) the faculty which he had earlier called "Faith," he now named "Reason."—Transl. This would make the corresponding "feeling" something much more specific than the mere cognitive intuition of God.

† On this, see also Calder in "Methodist Quarterly Review," April, 1862.

> "Jove's presence fills all space, upholds this ball;
> All need his aid; his power sustains us all,
> For we his offspring are."[†]

The same sentiment had been hymned in the same city by Cleanthes. This feeling of dependence and sense of obligation lie at the foundation of all religion. The Athenians also *possessed the religious emotions flowing from the feeling of dependence*—fear of offending the divinity which they felt over them, and an instinctive yearning after the Invisible. Finally, they felt *a consciousness of sin and made piacular sacrifices.*

But, turning to contemplate the dark side of the Athenian religion, we are confronted by the shocking realities of polytheism and idolatry. Modern inquiry, however, in penetrating beneath the exterior of these religious monstrosities, finds them to be mere excrescences upon a purer and simpler faith—a degeneracy from a state of primitive monotheism which seems to underlie the religion of humanity.[‡] And even during the

---

[*] This is Cudworth's rendering of κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονετέρους, (Acts xvii, 22,) and with this, exegetical writers substantially agree. The first chapter on the Religion of the Athenians appeared in the "Methodist Quarterly Review" for April, 1869.

[†] Aratus: "The Pheuomena," Book V, 5.

[‡] This position is earnestly controverted by certain writers, who hold that mankind has undergone a continuous and uniform development, religiously, from a state of fetichism, and that fetichism is incompatible with a sense of theistic unity. Having given this subject, however, an independent study, we have been surprised at the copiousness of the proof that Dr. Cocker's position is a valid one.

reign of these abominations, the *élite* in the realm of thought looked upon them with horror, and denounced them with a boldness tempered only by an instinctive respect for popular opinions. The genesis and significance of the Greek Mythology are discussed in this connection in words which ought to be made the preamble to every Christian text-book of the classical authors. (Pp. 128–160.) We commend the discussion earnestly to the attention of those bees in the world of thought who love to extract the honey even of poisonous flowers. Our author regards the Grecian Mythology as *a grand symbolic representation of the Divine as manifested in nature and providence.* (P. 139.)*

We reach here the heart of the discussion: *Is God cognizable by reason?* If a religious nature and destination appertain to man; if certain fundamental principles are found underlying the Grecian, and all other religions; if it be a clear presumption that the reason of man is furnished with necessary ideas or laws of thought correlated to the instinct and emotion of worship, let us see whether it be possible to give these ideas an articulate expression, and reproduce the spontaneous and instantaneous deduction by which reason bridges the gulf which separates the changeful and finite from the permanent, infinite, and eternal.

I. The idea of God is a common phenomenon of the universal intelligence. The proofs of this (pp. 89, 90) are found in common observation, in the voice of history, and in the concurrent testimony of travelers among savage tribes.

II. The idea of God, in its completeness, is not held to be a simple, direct, and immediate intuition of the reason alone, independently of all experience and all knowledge of the external world. It is a complex idea—a logical deduction from self-evident truths given in sense, conscience, and reason. The logical evolution of the theistic concept begins with the disengagement of certain ideas formulating themselves in primitive judgments which the mind intuitively perceives to be true necessarily and universally. Such are, "Every event implies a cause," "Every attribute implies a substance." These *a*

---

* He draws largely from the learned dissertation on this subject by Cudworth: "Intellectual System of the Universe," especially chap. iv. The reader will fail upon a coincident line of thought in Müller: "Chips from a German Workshop" vol. ii, pp. 142–169.

priori judgments constitute the major premise of the theistic syllogism. The minor premise is furnished by the facts of experience and observation. From these facts, the *à priori* laws of reason necessitate, as a conclusion, the affirmation of a God as the only valid explanation of the phenomena. Historically, or actually, the process is reversed. The phenomena of experience first come before the mind, and, in their presence, the latent laws of thought or primitive ideas of reason are roused into efficiency, and the judgment, by a natural and spontaneous logic, free from all reflection, and consequently from all possibility of error, affirms a necessary relation between the facts of experience and the *à priori* ideas of the reason.* The demonstration consists necessarily of *à priori* as well as *à posteriori* elements. It is of no use to point to the events and changes of the material universe as proof of the existence of a *First Cause*, unless we take account of the universal and necessary truth that "every change must have an efficient cause." There is no logical conclusiveness in the assertion of Paley, that "*experience* teaches us that a designer must be a person," because, as Hume justly remarks, our "experience" is narrowed down to a mere point, and "cannot be a rule for a universe;" but there is an infinitude of force in that *dictum* of reason that "intelligence, self-consciousness, and self-determination necessarily constitute personality."

III. The universe demands a God as its adequate explanation. The attempts of Positivism are futile and absurd. Mankind cannot be prevented from striving to pass beyond phenomena. We cannot even have a cognition of phenomena without the play of the regulative ideas of the reason. No notion of realities underlying phenomena can be given by phenomena themselves. It is given by reason in the presence of phenomena. These *à posteriori* and *à priori* data mutually condition each other. The relation between them is a law of thought and *a law of things*. It is a universal and necessary correlative which impels us to affirm that a living power is the correlation of the changing phases of the sensible world, and intelligence the correlative of the order which we discover in them. The author has given us an exhaustive table of the facts of the priori judgments constitute the major premise of the theistic syllogism. The minor premise is furnished by the facts of experience and observation. From these facts the *a priori* laws of reason necessitate, as a conclusion, the affirmation of a God as the only valid explanation of the phenomena. Historically, or actually, the process is reversed. The phenomena of experience first come before the mind, and, in their presence, the latent laws of thought or primitive ideas of reason are roused into efficiency, and the judgment, by a natural and spontaneous logic, free from all reflection, and consequently from all possibility of error, affirms a necessary relation between the facts of experience and the *a priori* ideas of the reason.* The demonstration consists necessarily of *a priori* as well as *a posteriori* elements. It is of no use to point to the events and changes of the material universe as proof of the existence of a *First Cause*, unless we take account of the universal and necessary truth that "every change must have an efficient cause." There is no logical conclusiveness in the assertion of Paley, that "experience teaches us that a designer must be a person," because, as Hume justly remarks, our "experience" is narrowed down to a mere point, and "cannot be a rule for a universe;" but there is an *infinitude* of force in that *dictum* of reason that "intelligence, self-consciousness, and self-determination, necessarily constitute personality."

---

* For a lucid treatment of this subject, see Cocker: "Methodist Quarterly Review," April, 1862.

III. The universe demands a God as its adequate explanation. The attempts of Positivism are futile and absurd. Mankind cannot be prevented from striving to pass beyond phenomena. We cannot even have a cognition of phenomena without the play of the regulative ideas of the reason. No notion of realities underlying phenomena can be given by phenomena themselves. It is given by reason in the presence of phenomena. These *a posteriori* and *a priori* data mutually condition each other. The relation between them is a law of thought and *a law of things*. It is a universal and necessary correlative which impels us to affirm that a living power is the foundation of the changing phases of the sensible world, and intelligence the correlative of the order which we discover in them. The author has given us an exhaustive table of the facts of the universe, material and mental, which may be regarded as "hints and adumbrations of the ultimate ground and reason and cause of the universe."—Pp. 175–177.

---

* For a lucid treatment of this subject, see Catholic Quarterly Review," April, 1872.

It thus appears that the phenomena of the universe cannot be explained on the basis of Positivism; and this, though we admit, as Descartes, Pascal, Leibnitz, Saisset, Mahan, and others have mistakenly and fatally done, that the universe is "infinite." Its "infinity" is only a mathematical infinity which might more correctly be styled *indefinity.* Infinity is not predicable of quantity. This principle solves the problem of Kant's "antinomies," and constitutes a complete refutation of Hume on the eternity of the universe.[*]

IV. In the field of consciousness are discovered elements or principles which in their regular and normal development transcend the limits of consciousness, and attain to a knowledge of Absolute Being, Absolute Reason, Absolute Good, that is, *God.* The mind is in possession of universal, necessary, absolute ideas, as the idea of space, the idea of cause. Reason, distinct from sense, is the organ or faculty for the cognition of these ideas. Their elimination from the mass of mixed knowledge in the mind is a work which has engaged the attention of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Cousin, and others, but it is yet incomplete. Our author presents a neat, compact, and symmetrical table of the principal ideas of this class. Here, in two pages, is the quintessence of the speculative thought of two chiliads of years.

Our author next passes in review, through two chapters, those philosophic theories which lead to the *denial that God is cognizable by reason.* Our appropriate limits do not permit a reproduction of even the gist of the discussion. J. S. Mill and the Idealists, Comte and the Materialists, Hamilton and the Nescientists, Watson and the Dogmatists, are taken in hand by turns, and in a few incisive sentences, each of which reaches to the marrow of the subject, each school is shown to be doing violence to the inexorable laws of thought. Positivism infracts the principle of causality in denying that we can proceed beyond a knowledge of phenomena and their laws. It dishonors the principle of intentionality in affirming that we can universe, material and mental, which may be regarded as "hints and adumbrations of the ultimate ground and reason and cause of the universe." — Pp. 173–177.

---

[*] Pp. 178–184. This principle has been presented and applied with masterly analysis and force by a writer in the "North American Review," No. CCV, Art. III, (1864.)

It thus appears that the phenomena of the universe cannot be explained on the basis of Positivism; and this, though we admit, as Descartes, Pascal, Leibnitz, Sewell, Mahan, and others have mistakenly and falsely done, that the universe is infinite. Its "infinity" is only a mathematical infinity, which might more correctly be styled *indefinity*. Infinity is not predicable of quantity. This principle solves the problem of Kant's "antinomies," and constitutes a complete refutation of Hume on the eternity of the universe.*

IV. In the field of consciousness are discovered elements or principles which in their regular and normal development transcend the limits of consciousness, and afford us a knowledge of Absolute Being, Absolute Reason, Absolute Good; that is, God. The mind is in possession of universal, necessary, absolute ideas, as the idea of space, the idea of cause. Reason, distinct from sense, is the organ or faculty for the cognition of these ideas. Their elimination from the mass of mixed knowledge in the mind is a work which has engaged the attention of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Cousin, and others, but it is yet incomplete. Our author presents a neat, compact, and symmetrical table of the principal ideas of this class. Here, in two pages, is the quintessence of the speculative thought of two thousand years.

Our author next passes in review, through two chapters, those philosophic theories which lead to the denial that God is *cognizable by reason*. Our appropriate limits do not permit a reproduction of even the gist of the discussion. J. S. Mill and the Idealists, Comte and the Materialists, Hamilton and the Nescientists, Mansel and the Dogmatists, are taken in hand by turns, and in a few incisive sentences, each of which reaches to the marrow of the subject, each school is shown to do violence to the inexorable laws of thought. Positivism infracts the principle of causality in denying that we can proceed beyond a knowledge of phenomena and their laws. It dishonors the principle of Substantiality in affirming that we can only know what *is*, and never *why* it is.[*] The Hamiltonian Philosophy of the Unconditioned is shown to involve a discrediting of one portion of the testimony of consciousness, and thus a conflict with the fundamental principle of the natural-realistic school. The further examination of this subject is especially able. The Dogmatic theologians are shown to attack the principle of causality, in affirming that philosophy can only attain to the idea of an "eternal succession" of phenomena. They attack the principle of the unconditioned in denying that human reason passes spontaneously from the finite to the notion of the infinite. They invalidate, also, the principle of unity and the evidence of the moral intuitions, and fail to discern the real meaning of certain passages of Scripture.[†]

---

* Pp. 178–184. This principle has been presented and applied with scientific analysis and force by a writer in the "North American Review," No. 203, pp. [illegible] (1864.)

The next six chapters are devoted to an examination of the historical development of Greek philosophy. This may be regarded as another form of proof of the proposition that *God is cognizable by the reason.* An inductive generalization from the facts of Greek speculation leads to the affirmation of the proposition. More strictly speaking, however, this part of the work may be viewed as a citation of illustrations, or confirmations of the main thesis.

Following Zeller in the grouping of the schools of Greece, we find that the Pre-Socratic were *physical* in the point of view from which they contemplated the problems of speculative philosophy; the Socratic were *psychological*, and the Post-Socratic were *ethical.* The first make the world the great center of inquiry; the second, the "ideas" of things—truth and being; the third fall back upon the practical conduct of life as the chief interest of philosophy. We cannot follow the author through his compact but lucid digest of the opinions of these noble pioneers of thought, but heartily commend the chapters not only to the student of philosophy, but not less, the student only know what *is*, and never *why* it is."* The Hamiltonian Philosophy of the Unconditioned is shown to involve a discrediting of one portion of the testimony of consciousness, and thus a conflict with the fundamental principle of the natural realistic school. The further examination of this subject is especially able. The Dogmatic theologians are shown to attack the principle of causality, in affirming that philosophy can only attain to the idea of an "eternal succession" of phenomena. They attack the principle of the unconditioned in denying that human reason passes spontaneously from the finite to the notion of the infinite. They invalidate, also, the principle of unity and the evidence of the moral intuitions, and fail to discern the real meaning of certain passages of Scripture.‡

---

[*] In this connection our author rather discredits the "nebular hypothesis," fortifying himself with an array of authorities. It might be said, however, that the first cited—Sir William Herschel—was the real originator of the hypothesis, (Sir Wm. Herschel: "Philosophical Transactions," 1811.) If this theory is to be decided by a vote, we may cite on the affirmative, Helmholz, Dana, Dawson, Hunt, (T. S.,) Tyndal, Thomson, (Sir Wm.,) Arago, J. S. Mill, Sæmann, Meunier, Scheller, and the generality of geologists and astronomers of the present day. Objectors and objections which date back twenty years have lost all weight in consequence of the new data (especially spectroscopic) furnished by recent science.

[†] For instance: Acts xvii, 27; Romans i, 19–21, 32.

The next six chapters are devoted to an examination of the historical development of Greek philosophy. This may be regarded as another form of proof of the proposition that God is *cognizable by the reason*. An inductive generalization from the facts of Greek speculation leads to the affirmation of the proposition. More strictly speaking, however, this part of the work may be viewed as a citation of illustrations, or confirmations of the main thesis.

Following Zeller in the grouping of the schools of Greece, we find that the Pre-Socratic were *physical* in the point of view from which they contemplated the problems of speculative philosophy; the Socratic were *psychological*, and the Post-Socratic were *ethical*. The first make the world the great center of inquiry; the second, the "ideas" of things—truth and being; the third fall back upon the practical conduct of life as the chief interest of philosophy. We cannot follow the author through his compact but lucid digest of the opinions of these noble pioneers of thought, but heartily commend the chapters not only to the student of philosophy, but not less, the student of theology and of history. These six chapters form a neat and concise compend of the history of Greek philosophy—not a mere chronological table of facts, but a body of facts embedded in a matrix of thought—such an exposition as discloses the spinal marrow—the common subjective, animating principle of those three centuries of manly mental struggle. We can only make disconnected reference to some of the prominent conclusions from this survey.

---

* In this connection our author rather discredits the "nebular hypothesis," fortifying himself with an array of authorities. It might be said, however, that the first cited—Sir William Herschel—was the real originator of the hypothesis. (See Wm. Herschel; "Philosophical Transactions," 1811.) If this theory is to be decided by a vote, we may cite on the affirmative, Helmholtz, Lewes, Peirce, Henry (C. S.,) Tyndal, Thomson, (Sir Wm.,) Agassiz, J. S. Mill, Lockyer, Hinrichs—(through) and the generality of geologists and astronomers of the present day. Difficulties and objections which date back twenty years have lost all weight in consequence of the new data (especially spectroscopic) furnished by recent science.

‡ For instance: Acts xvii. 27; Romans i. 19-21, &c.

The bifurcation of speculative thought began in the Pre-Socratic age. The Ionian school, from their stand-point, tended toward Sensationalism; and the Italian, from theirs, toward Idealism. The issue, theologically, was material Pantheism on one hand, and ideal Pantheism on the other. These divergent streams of thought had their common source in one fundamental principle or law of the human mind—*the intuition of unity*, or "the desire to comprehend all the facts of the universe in a single formula, and consummate all conditional knowledge in the unity of unconditioned existence." The radical error of sensationalism is the denial of the validity of the testimony of consciousness in reference to supra-sensuous phenomena; while the fatal fault of idealism is a similar denial in reference to sensuous phenomena. Both alike, by discrediting consciousness in one affirmation, virtually discredit it in all, and set us afloat in an atmosphere of phantoms. From such philosophy no theistic result is possible, save universal skepticism. Accordingly, the Sophists signalize the completion of the first cycle of philosophic thought.

It is interesting to note another evidence that, even in abstract thinking, there "is nothing new under the sun." Hegelianism existed two thousand years before Hegel. Parmenides of Elea held that all phenomenal existences are but modes of the Absolute, and seems to have been the inventor of the aphorisms, "All is one," "Thought and being are identical." We might add, however, that Heraclitus had previously asserted that contradictory propositions may be consistent.*

Socrates, by the inductive use of the phenomena of consciousness, was a patron of the inductive method—a method which Francis Bacon no more originated than he did the other laws of thought. Plato enunciated the "law of sufficient reason"—

---

* Aristot.: *Ethic. Nic.*, lib. viii, I.

universally attributed to Leibnitz—in these words: "Whatever is generated is necessarily generated from a certain *αἰτίαν*"—ground, reason, or cause—"for it is wholly impossible that any thing should be generated without a cause." The ontology of Plato, after having served as a starting-point for other philosophers for a period of twenty centuries, remains to-day nearly the most perfect system extant. The Aristotelian Organon has equally survived the criticisms of the entire course of philosophy. Aristotle proposed three forms of theistic proof: 1. The Ontological, based on our necessary idea of an eternal and immutable *substance;* 2. The Cosmological, based on our necessary idea of *causality* as the correlative of effect, and *intelligence* as the correlative of harmony and contrivance; * 3. The Moral Proof.

Pyrrhonism marks the transition from the Socratic to the Post-Socratic schools. In the latter, Epicureanism manifests a decline of the spirit of ontological speculation, and Stoicism signalizes its almost complete supersedure by the ethical spirit.

For us, however, the most important aspects of Greek philosophy are its theological results. These are gathered together in the last two chapters of the work under review. No thoughtful person can glance over this summary without being convinced that Greek philosophy had an important propædeutic office to perform for Christianity. The object of all philosophy is to systematize the results of thought, and attain to a basis of certainty. Its especial aim is the disclosure of the Supreme Reality which underlies the phenomenal world. The correlation of the human mind to the Divine renders this a hopeful effort. Again, the Author of nature is the Author of revelation. The "true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" "shone on the mind of Anaxagoras and Socrates and Plato, as well as on the mind of Rahab, Cornelius, and the Syro-Phœnician woman, and, in a higher form, and with a clearer and richer effulgence, on the mind of Moses, Isaiah, Paul, and John." No wonder, then, that "in the teachings of Socrates and Plato we find a striking *harmony* of sentiment, and even form of expression, with some parts of the Christian revelation;" and in the speculations of Plato "catch glimpses of a world of universally attributed to Leibnitz—in these words: "Whatever is generated is necessarily generated from a certain cause,—ground, reason, or cause—for it is wholly impossible that anything should be generated without a cause." The ontology of Plato, after having served as a starting-point, for other philosophers for a period of twenty centuries, remains to-day nearly the most perfect system extant. The Aristotelian Theism has equally survived the vicissitudes of the entire course of philosophy. Aristotle proposed three forms of theistic proof:* 1. The Ontological, based on our necessary idea of an eternal and immutable *substance*; 2. The Cosmological, based on our necessary idea of *causality* as the correlative of effect, and *intelligence* as the correlative of harmony and contrivance; * 3. The Moral Proof.

---

* Cosmological, as here used = ætiological, Cocker + cosmological, Cocker + teleological, Cocker = cosmological, Kant + physico-theological, Kant. See sequel of this Article.

Pyrrhonism marks the transition from the Socratic to the Post-Socratic schools. In the latter, rapid reaction manifests a decline of the spirit of ontological speculation, and Stoicism signalizes its almost complete suppression by the ethical spirit.

For us, however, the most important aspects of Greek philosophy are its theological results. These are gathered together in the last two chapters of the work under review. No thoughtful person can glance over this summary without being convinced that Greek philosophy had an important propædeutic office to perform for Christianity. The object of all philosophy is to systematize the results of thought, and attain to a basis of certainty. Its especial aim is the discovery of the Supreme Reality which underlies the phenomenal world. The correlation of the human mind to the Divine renders this a hopeful effort. Again, the Author of nature is the Author of revelation. The "true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" "shone on the mind of Anaxagoras and Socrates and Plato, as well as on the mind of [illegible], Confucius, and the Sino-Phœnician writers, and, in a higher form, and with a clearer and richer effulgence, on the mind of Moses, Isaiah, Paul, and John." No wonder, then, that "in the teachings of Socrates and Plato we find a striking *harmony* of sentiment, and even form of expression, with some parts of the Christian revelation;" and in the speculations of Plato "catch glimpses of a weight of ideas not unlike that which Christianity discloses, and hear words not unfamiliar to those who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—P. 459.

---

*Ontological, as here used = aprioristic. [illegible] cosmological, Cosmo-teleological. Kant's proposed [illegible]. See [illegible] of this Article.

Christianity, if its enunciations would not be nugatory, must sustain some relations to human reason, and to the progressive developments of human thought in the ages before Christ. "Christianity did not break suddenly upon the world as a new commencement, altogether unconnected with the past, and wanting in all points of sympathy and contact with the then present. It proceeded along lines of thought which had been laid through ages of preparation; it clothed itself in forms of speech which had been molded by centuries of education, and it appropriated to itself a moral and intellectual culture which had been effected by long periods of severest discipline. It was, in fact, the consummation of the whole moral and religious history of the world."—Pp. 461, 462. Greek civilization sustained direct preparatory relations to the Christian system. It was the most perfect civilization which the world had yet witnessed, and the highest attainable by human nature without the specific reinforcement of moral and religious ideas and demonstrations which was now impending in Christianity. This civilization the conquests of Alexander propagated from Antioch and Alexandria. The Greek language, enriched by Plato and Aristotle, was not only the most copious and perfect of all tongues, but was also the most perfectly adapted to serve as the vehicle of moral and religious, and even Christian, ideas. Greek philosophy, too, had gradually educated the human mind to the contemplation of that purity, holiness, justice, and spirituality which were to characterize pre-eminently the Christian teaching. But philosophy had done its utmost, and mankind had not yet attained to a full and impressive sense of the majesty and holiness and presence of God. It was a moment of despair. It was the grand climacteric in the life of humanity. Paul appeared and preached Christ, and the heart of the Greek bounded responsively.

Let us see a little more specifically what service Greek philosophy rendered to Christianity. We have said it served as an education of the intellect of the race, as Judaism served for the discipline of the religious nature. But all logical training of the intellect leads it toward the same Supreme Reality

which Hebrew revelation discloses directly. The growth of philosophy is a reverent approximation toward God. Mankind, like children, first accepted God with a spontaneous faith. Then, like the youth, they plunged into misguided speculations, fruitless sophisms, and distressing doubts. Lastly, like the man of matured wisdom, they attained an age of reflective consciousness, and glimpsed with clearer vision the God who had been at first simply an object of blind faith. In the history of Greece, the Homeric age was the national childhood ; the Pre-Socratic, the transitional, and the Post-Socratic, the philosophic age. In these facts of intellectual and religious history we discern a true development and a progressive preparation. It is discernible,

I. In the field of Theistic conceptions. In this field its tendency was to dethrone the false gods and enthrone the true one. This is seen,

1. In the release of the popular mind from polytheistic notions and the purifying and spiritualizing of the Theistic idea. The idea of a Supreme Power is not the product of philosophy. It is the immanent spontaneous thought of humanity. Without tuition or suggestion, man sees God in the impressive phenomena of nature transpiring around him. He translates her mysterious manifestations in the light of the feeling of the Divine which bathes his soul. The sun, the mountain, and the storm command his veneration as the manifestations of the felt Deity. Then, in the lapse of time, he forgets their symbolical character, and worships them as gods, or as the dwelling-places of gods. He becomes a polytheist; and, in attempting to embody his necessarily anthropomorphic conceptions of his gods, he is led into idolatry. But now, when the era of reflection and inquiry arrives, he discovers the absurdity of many of his theistic notions, and the stubborn inscrutableness of the Divine nature, and he begins to fear he has been wholly deluded. He doubts. He surrenders himself to speculation ; he seeks for that which must be the first principle of all things. He fancies it discovered in "water," or "air," or "fire." Unsatisfied, he seeks it in "numbers," or in purely abstract "ideas," or it may be an Anaxagoras glimpses it in "mind." But the human soul still longs for a personal God. "The heart of man cries out for the living God." These abstractions are unsatisfying, and humanity is again skeptical and restless. Now Socrates

which Hebrew revelation discloses directly. The growth of philosophy is a nearer approximation toward God. Mankind, like children, first accepted God with a spontaneous faith. Then, like the youth, they plunged into unbridled speculations, restless sophisms, and disturbing doubts. Lastly, like the man of matured wisdom, they attained an age of reflective consciousness, and glimpsed with clearer vision the God who had been at first simply an object of blind faith. In the history of Greece, the Homeric age was the national childhood; the Pre-Socratic, the transitional, and the Post-Socratic the philosophic age. In these facts of intellectual and religious history we discover a wise development and a progressive comprehension. It is discernible,

I. In the field of Theistic conceptions. In this field the tendency was to dethrone the false gods and enthrone the true one. This is seen,

1. In the release of the popular mind from polytheistic notions and the purifying and spiritualizing of the Theistic idea. The idea of a Supreme Power is not the product of philosophy. It is the immanent spontaneous thought of humanity. Without tuition or suggestion, man sees God in the impressive phenomena of nature transpiring around him. He translates her mysterious manifestations in the light of the feeling of the Divine which bathes his soul. The sun, the mountain, and the storm command his veneration as the manifestations of the All-Deity. Then, in the lapse of time, he forgets their symbolical character, and worships them as gods, or as the dwelling-places of gods. He becomes a polytheist; and, in attempting to embody his necessarily anthropomorphic conceptions of his gods, he is led into idolatry. But now, when the era of reflection and inquiry arrives, he discovers the absurdity of many of his theistic notions, and the sublime incomprehensibleness of the Divine nature; and he begins to fear he has been wholly deluded. He doubts. He surrenders himself to speculation; he seeks for that which must be the first principle of all things. He fancies it discovered in "water," or "air," or "fire." Unsatisfied, he seeks it in "numbers," or in purely abstract "ideas;" or it may be as Anaxagoras glimpses it in "mind." But the human soul still longs for a personal God. "The heart of man cries out for the living God." These abstractions are unsatisfying, and humanity is again skeptical and restless. New Systems

and Plato introvert the mental gaze, and, in the analysis of thought, discover elements which at once announce themselves to consciousness as out of necessary relation to the things of time and sense—ideas, truths, which are seen to be necessary, universal, and eternal—truths which would beam in the firmament of mind though the worlds cease to exist. These are rays from the Eternal Source of truth. Here, in this world of ideas, is the only solid ground on which faith and reason may embrace each other. In this Eternal Reality is the absolute ground of all causality, all thought, all beauty, all goodness.

Such was the progress of theistic speculation in Greece. The inevitable tendency toward a unity served to gradually undermine the popular polytheistic faith which had usurped the place of the simple theism of the earlier ages. The Eleatics rejected the gross anthropomorphism of the Homeric theology. Socrates held that the Supreme Being is the immaterial, infinite Governor of all; that the world bears the stamp of his intelligence, and that he is the author and vindicator of all moral laws. Plato earnestly inveighs against the anthropomorphism and polytheism of the Greek mythology, and having himself risen to purer conceptions of the Deity, he insists that he ought to be represented as he is—without imperfections, the author of all good, and the punisher of sin. "There is no imperfection," says Plato, "in the beauty or goodness of God;" "he is a God of truth, and cannot lie;" "he is a being of perfect simplicity and truth in deed and word."[*] Aristotle, though less spiritual, enunciates views entirely incompatible with the popular mythology of the Greeks. Thus, the popular notions of Divine existence which had been current from the time of Orpheus and Homer were gradually dissipated, and the way was cleared for Christian theism.

The preparatory office of Greek philosophy, in the region of speculative thought, is seen,

2. In the development of the theistic argument in a logical form. The growth of Greek philosophy evolved, in due succession, every form of argument employed by modern writers in proof of the being of God. Our author inclines to except the "moral argument;" but we believe that Plato's ontological proof of the existence of the Supreme Good ought to be regarded

---

[*] Plato: "Republic," Book II, secs. 18–21.

and Plato interrogated the mental grasp, and, in the analysis of thought, discover elements which at once commend themselves to consciousness as out of necessary relation to the things of time and sense—ideas, truths, which are seen to be necessary, universal, and eternal—truths which would remain in the firmament of mind though the worlds cease to exist. These are rays from the Eternal Source of truth. Here, in this world of ideas, is the only solid ground on which faith and reason may embrace each other. In this Eternal Reality is the absolute ground of all causality, all thoughts, all beauty, all goodness.

Such was the progress of theistic speculation in Greece. The inevitable tendency toward a unity served to gradually undermine the popular polytheistic faith which had usurped the place of the simple theism of the earlier ages. The Eleatics rejected the gross anthropomorphism of the Homeric theology. Socrates held that the Supreme Being is the immaterial, infinite Governor of all; that the world bears the stamp of his intelligence, and that he is the author and vindicator of all moral law. Plato earnestly inveighs against the anthropomorphism and polytheism of the Greek mythology, and having himself risen to purer conceptions of the Deity, he insists that he ought to be represented as he is—without imperfections, the author of all good, and the punisher of sin. "There is no imperfection," says Plato, "in the beauty or goodness of God;" "he is a God of truth, and cannot lie;" "he is a being of perfect simplicity and truth in deed and word."* Aristotle, though less spiritual, inculcates views entirely incompatible with the popular mythology of the Greeks. Thus the popular notions of Divine existence which had been current from the time of Orpheus and Homer were gradually dissipated, and the way was cleared for Christian theism.

The preparatory office of Greek philosophy, in the region of speculative thought, is seen,

2. In the development of the theistic argument in a logical form. The growth of Greek philosophy evolved, in its progression, every form of argument employed by modern writers in proof of the being of God. Our author declines to accept the "moral argument;" but we believe that Plato's ontological proof of the existence of the Supreme Good ought to be regarded

---

* Plato: "Republic," Book II. secs. 19–21.

as involving the moral argument. This, as we shall attempt to show, is but a single aspect or branch of the ontological. We might add the statement more distinctly than Dr. Cocker has presented it, that the argument from "Common Consent" is also as old as Socrates.[*] Universal beliefs were made by the Stoics an argument for the existence of God; and before the Stoics, Alexander of Aphrodisias ascribed great authority to widely prevalent beliefs, "since," he asserts, "mankind generally do not greatly err from the truth."[†] Cicero declares that "in any matter whatever the consent of all nations is to be reckoned a law of nature;"[‡] and such opinions have received the sanction of modern philosophy.[§]

II. In the department of *ethical* ideas and principles:

1. In the awakening and enthronement of conscience as a law of duty, and the elevation and purification of the moral idea. Here we find an order of succession in the evolution of moral ideas corresponding with that observed in the field of speculative thought. These stages are traceable equally in the individual and the national mind. We recognize (1) in the age of Homer, Hesiod, the Gnomic poets, and the seven Wise Men, a period of "popular and unconscious morality;" (2) in the following age, beginning with Protagoras, a "transitional skeptical or sophistical period;" and (3) in the Socratic age, "the philosophic or conscious" period of morality. We must refer the reader to the pages of our author (pp. 495–505) for the illustrations and proofs.

2. In the fact that, by an experiment conducted on the largest scale, it demonstrated the insufficiency of reason to elaborate a perfect ideal of moral excellence, and develop the moral forces necessary to secure its realization. The moral idea in Socrates, Plato, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and Seneca rose to a sublime height, and developed a noble and heroic character. Yet the cardinal virtues of the ancient ethical systems are prudence, justice, temperance, and courage. The gentler virtues of humility, meekness, forgiveness of injuries, love of

---

[*] Plato: "Apology," sec. 32.

[†] *De Fato*, ii; Ritter: "History Ancient Philosophy," vol. iv, 242.

[‡] Cicero: Tuscul., i, 13.

[§] Grotius: *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, Proleg. ii; Butler: "Analogy," (Introduction;) Quatrefages: *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1860–61; Saisset: "Essay on Religious Philosophy. Edinburgh translation, I, 33, (Note.)

enemies, universal benevolence—"graces which give beauty to character and bless society"—are scarcely known. The inculcation of humility, forbearance, and forgiveness by Epictetus and Seneca is not clearly an attainment of philosophy unilluminated by the spirit of contemporary Christianity. Socrates, "the noblest of all the Grecians," had no world-wide sympathies which concerned themselves with interests beyond the limits of his nationality. "Plato, in his solicitude to reduce his ideal state to a harmonious whole answering to his idea of justice, sacrificed the individual. He superseded private property, broke up the sacred relations of family and home, degraded woman, and tolerated slavery."—P. 507. Plato himself asserted the inadequacy of human teaching and effort, and announced that "Virtue is the gift of God." *

III. In the department of religious feeling and *sentiment*, the propædeutic office of Greek philosophy is further seen.

1. "It awakened in man the sense of distance and estrangement from God and the need of a mediator—'a daysman betwixt us that might lay his hand upon us both.'" The first stage of human history recognized the divine as near. Nature was the supernatural. The second or reflective stage removed God to the region of the unseen. It made him abstract and difficult to discern. Man now longed for an approachable Father, Counselor, and Friend. Humanity was thus prepared for the announcement of an incarnation.

2. It deepened the consciousness of guilt, and awakened a desire for redemption. In the Homeric period the idea of wrong-doing was certainly present, but it was vague and gross. The sentiment uppermost in the great tragedians is the invincibility of the moral law. "The sinner must suffer for his sins." "But after the law comes the Gospel. First, the controversy, then the reconciliation. A dim consciousness of sin and retribution as a fact, and of reconciliation as a *want*, seems to have revealed itself even in the darkest periods of history. This consciousness underlies not a few of the Greek tragedies."—P. 516. Offended justice is appeased by divine interpositions. The office assigned to Jove's son, Apollo, in the "Prometheus Unbound," is certainly suggestive of the Christian doctrine of

---

* On the insufficiency of philosophy, see the concluding portion of Farrar's "Seekers after God." (Pp. 318–336.)

enemies, universal benevolence—"graces which give beauty to character and bless society"—are scarcely known. The inculcation of humility, forbearance, and forgiveness by Epictetus and Seneca is not clearly an attainment of philosophy uninfluenced by the spirit of contemporary Christianity. Socrates, "the noblest of all the Grecians," had no world-wide sympathies which concerned themselves with interests beyond the limits of his nationality. "Plato, in his solicitude to realize his ideal state to a harmonious whole answering to his idea of justice, sacrificed the individual. He superseded private property, broke up the sacred relations of family and home, degraded woman, and tolerated slavery."—P. 507. Plato himself asserted the inadequacy of human teaching and effort, and announced that "Virtue is the gift of God."*

III. In the department of religious feeling and sentiment, the propædeutic office of Greek philosophy is further seen.

1. "It awakened in man the sense of distance and estrangement from God and the need of a mediator—'a daysman betwixt us that might lay his hand upon us both.' The first stage of human history recognized the divine as near. Nature was the supernatural. The second or reflective stage removed God to the region of the unseen. It made him abstract and difficult to discern. Man now longed for an approachable Father, Counselor, and Friend. Humanity was thus prepared for the announcement of an incarnation.

2. It deepened the consciousness of guilt, and awakened a desire for redemption. In the Homeric period the idea of wrong-doing was certainly present, but it was vague and gross. The sentiment uppermost in the great tragedians is the inviolability of the moral law. "The sinner must suffer for his sins." "But after the law comes the Gospel. First, the controversy; then the reconciliation. A dim consciousness of sin and retribution as a fact, and of reconciliation as a want, seems to have revealed itself even in the darkest periods of history. This consciousness underlies not a few of the Greek tragedies."—P. 516. Offended justice is appeased by divine interposition. The office assigned to Jove's son, Apollo, in the "Prometheus Unbound," is certainly suggestive of the Christian doctrine of

---

* On the insufficiency of philosophy, see the concluding portion of Farrar's "Seekers after God" (pp. 316–326.)

reconciliation. Plato more than once betrays his longing for a divine helper. The obstacles to virtue, as he says, are great, and insurmountable to feeble man. Plato admits it with a spirit of sadness, and says it is the work of God to restore fallen humanity. He lets fall obscure hints of a coming Conqueror of sin, an Assuager of pain, an Averter of evil; but he indulges rather in desires than hopes.[*] The experience of Plato found its counterpart in the experience of Paul prior to his conversion. "What I do I approve not; for I do not what I would, but what I hate." "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" But Paul, conscious of deliverance, was enabled to say, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord;" while Plato could only desire, and hope, and wait for the coming Deliverer.

The history of religions and philosophies is thus the confirmation of Christianity.[†] We may indeed regard the revelation of God in the human soul to be as genuine and authentic, though not as clear and influential, as the revelation in the person and teaching of Christ. These two revelations are harmonious, and must be so. Greek philosophy had made the calculations, from the data of human consciousness, that a Saviour was needed—that a Saviour must be predicated. Paul came to Athens and pointed out the Saviour whose want had been felt—giving sight to the blind instinct that had been feeling after God, and preaching a Gospel which fulfilled the prophetic longings of the struggling ages of Greek philosophy.

Such is the line of argument pursued by the author of "Christianity and Greek Philosophy." We must refer the reader to the work itself for an idea of the fullness and symmetry with which the discussion is evolved. We may yet state that it embraces in its compass neat monographic treatments reconciliation. Plato more than once betrays his longing for a divine helper. The obstacles to virtue, as he says, are great, and insurmountable to feeble man. Plato admits it with a spirit of sadness, and says it is the work of God to restore fallen humanity. He lets fall obscure hints of a coming Conqueror of sin, an Assuager of pain, an Averter of evil; but he indulges rather in desires than hopes.* The experience of Plato found its counterpart in the experience of Paul prior to his conversion. "What I do I approve not; for I do not what I would, but what I hate." "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" But Paul, conscious of deliverance, was enabled to say, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord;" while Plato could only desire, and hope, and wait for the coming Deliverer.

---

[*] Socrates in express words prophesies the future advent of some heaven-sent Guide.—Xenophon: *Mem.* I, iv, 14; Plato: *Alcib.*, ii.

[†] Philosophy, says Clement, was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ."—Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, i, § 28. Philosophy, before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness, and now it proves useful for godliness, being in some sort a preliminary discipline—*προπαιδεία τις οὖσα*—for those who reap the fruits of the faith through demonstration.—Ib., i, 5, § 28. "Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament—*διαθήκην*—to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy."—Ib., *Strom.* vi, 8, § 67. Similar testimony has been abundantly rendered by Augustine, Origen, and Justin Martyr.

The history of religions and philosophies is thus the confirmation of Christianity.† We may indeed regard the revelation of God in the human soul to be as genuine and authentic, though not as clear and full-orbed, as the revelation in the person and teaching of Christ. These two revelations are harmonious, and must be so. Greek philosophy had made the calculations, from the data of human consciousness, that a Saviour was needed—that a Saviour must be predicated. Paul came to Athens and pointed out the Saviour whose want had been felt—giving sight to the blind instinct that had been feeling after God, and preaching a Gospel which fulfilled the prophetic longings of the struggling ages of Greek philosophy.

Such is the line of argument pursued by the author of "Christianity and Greek Philosophy." We must refer the reader to the work itself for an idea of the fullness and symmetry with which the discussion is evolved. We may yet state that it embraces in its compass most monographic treatments of a number of subsidiary theses. Often, nevertheless, the full discussion of a topic must be gathered from widely-separated pages; and this, perhaps, is a defect in the arrangement of the volume.

---

* Socrates in express words prophesies the future advent of some Instructor from the Gods.—Xenophon: Mem. I, iv, 14; Plato: Alcib. ii.

† Philosophy, says Clement, was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ."—Clem. Alex., Strom., i, § 5. "Philosophy, before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness, and now it proves useful for godliness, being in some sort a preliminary discipline—schoolmaster or elder—for those who reap the fruits of the faith through demonstration."—Ib., i, 5, § 28. "Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament—[illegible]—to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy."—Ib., Strom. vi, 8, § 67. Similar testimony has been abundantly rendered by Augustine, Origen, and Justin Martyr.

The work shows the signs of study and erudition upon every page. But it is not simply a *learned* treatise, for the author possesses a remarkably keen and penetrating insight into subjects of speculative inquiry, and hews out with trenchant blade, and in rapid succession, clean-cut blocks of thought to fit into the beautiful structure of his growing argument. His mind's eye sees with the clearness of noonday in realms which are thick darkness to ordinary vision. He revels with playful unconsciousness of effort among the ponderous problems of metaphysical research, shedding upon each the light of a brilliant intellect, transmitted through a style as pellucid as crystal. His pages resound from beginning to end with the changes rung upon his favorite ontological conceptions. Indeed, the only fault of the book seems to arise from the circumstance that the author is so completely possessed by his favorite thought that it is always present in his mind whatever subsidiary theme he handles, and, like a ruling passion, always finds some avenue to utterance. This leads sometimes to a premature broaching of the heart of an impending discussion, and by a division of forces somewhat weakens, in some cases, the effect of the presentation. Thus, in treating Plato he lets fall something of Plato's ontology on almost every page. Quite a full statement is presented three times: first, in treating of Plato's Pyschology; second, under the head of Dialectic; and, finally, under Ontology proper. That the author's positive theistic system, ultimately argued out so lucidly in its various aspects, is considerably scattered in presentation, will be apparent from the attempt to make all the references on any leading topic. Still, these peculiarities proceed from the influence of a strongly dominant idea, and the tendency is to make it a dominant idea in the reader's mind. In perpetually turning the subject over he always exposes some new side. Every presentation is in fresh phrase, and is brought forward from a different direction. If the shadows of coming conclusions are sometimes cast before, they at least serve, like "prophetic types" in geologic history, to proclaim a unity of thought in

the progress of the evolution. The style is dignified, enriched with a copious vocabulary, forcible, sometimes sententious, and always remarkably transparent. It is somewhat freighted with brief but apt quotations, and foreign words; but these almost always add some meaning to the text. The comprehensibility of the work would be improved if its skeletal structure were a little less disguised, though in the subordinate parts the method is as noticeable as it is admirable. A detailed analysis, showing the subordination of parts, would very much aid the student and general reader. This suggestion is made under the conviction that it is a treatise which might be studied with great profit by all intelligent clergymen and candidates for the ministry. Indeed, as before stated, the subjects treated and the views presented cannot, in the present age, be safely passed by without earnest study by the "defenders of the faith."

In reviewing the work of Dr. Cocker we had purposed to avoid any general discussion of the question of the knowability of God through the powers of reason. Our estimate of this work is so high that we thought it would prove a better service to the reader to present simply a miniature portrait of its method than to attempt an original essay. We conclude, therefore, by making a mere memorandum—partly by way of *résumé*—of the various forms of theistic proof, showing that every proof inevitably hinges on the validity of a primitive belief or intuition of reason.

1. The argument from Common Consent. We find religious impressions, faiths, and practices a universal fact of humanity. (1.) They existed, if we rightly interpret the indications, even in the Stone Age of the life of humanity.* (2.) They are abundantly exemplified in the existence and prevalence of great religious systems among those portions of the human family that have risen above the stage of savageism.† (3.) They

---

* Quatrafages: *Rapport sur le Progrès de l'Anthropologie*, 1868; Duke of Argyll: "Primeval Man;" Figuier: "Primitive Man," and many other authorities. This position is questioned (we think through the influence of preconceived opinions) by Lubbock: "Pre-historic Times," and "Origin of Civilization," and Vogt: "Lectures on Pre-historic Man."

† See, for condensed and accessible accounts of these, (in addition to the work of Dr. Cocker,) Clark (Freeman): "Ten Great Religions," (to these ten we would add Lao-tse-ism and the systems of the Aztecs and Peruvians;) Moffat: "A Com-

characterize the life even of lowest savages. We are aware of contradictory statements.* Formerly, missionaries denied the lowest savages a spark of religious fire through zeal for the importance of written Revelation. Recently their theological antipodes have made the same denial for the purpose of undermining the foundations of Revelation. We have examined the charges and specifications in detail, and our judgment is that the charges are "not proven." However gratifying it would be to spread the facts before our readers, we must forbear. (4.) The fact has impressed itself upon the minds of thoughtful writers in all ages. We could quote Alexander of Aphrodisias, Socrates, Plato, Zeno of Cittium, Cicero, St. Paul, Augustine, Galen, Anselm, Descartes, Leibnitz, Barrow, Butler, Herder, Ritter, Ad. Pictet, Carpenter, Calderwood, M'Cosh, Spencer, and many others, to prove that if theistic ideas do not exist fully formed in the minds of lowest savages, they manifest, at least, a religious susceptibility and predisposition which could not exist without a connatural foundation.

But it is not necessary that these ideas, or even predispositions, should be established in every case. There are whole tribes, as there are single individuals, which cannot reasonably be taken as tests and standards of normal humanity. We may throw them out if we choose.

Could we go no further, we have in these universal phenomena the data for a "philosophy of religion." *Why* this common consent? We have listened to the solution of Comte. We have strained our mental vision till we feel the symptoms of strabismus in endeavoring to reconcile the paradoxes of Hegel; but we remain unsatisfied. The religious consciousness is *characteristic of humanity*, and we demand the sanction of its affirmations. We feel borne toward the conclusion that the voice of humanity is the voice of truth. This is the verdict of the ages. *Πάντων μέτρον ὁ ἄνθρωπος—vox populi vox Dei*—the sentiment of humanity is the utterance of God.

---

parative History of Religions;" Müller (Max): "Chips from a German Workshop," vols. i, ii, iii, and "Lectures on the Science of Religion, with Papers on Buddhism."

* Sir John Lubbock's works, cited above; Burton: "Abeokuta," vol. i, p. 179; Darwin: "Descent of Man."

But is such an argument a demonstration? It is, *if* the voice of humanity is the voice of truth. The conclusion hinges on the validity of a primitive, necessary belief. Is that which mankind universally and necessarily believes, to be taken as a presentation of the reality of things?

Let us see if it be possible to rise to a knowledge of God by any chain of thought which does not involve this link.

2. The argument from Direct Revelation. Here, it seems at first, is an unimpeachable demonstration. But suppose ourselves in a position to witness the immediate manifestations of the Divine presence, and to listen to the audible voice of God, what proof have we that the phenomenon is not an illusion of our senses? or that any of our sensations are not illusory? We receive an impression upon our *sensorium*, and *believe* because we must; but that is all. What sanction has our belief? Next, suppose we had the best of grounds for assuming the reality of *something* making the outward manifestation, how could we know that reality to be such as mankind conceives the nature of God to be? Without an antecedent notion of God the sensible manifestation could only announce itself as a finite phenomenon. Whence the notions of intelligence, goodness, infinity, rising up in the soul in presence of a finite phenomenon? This "revelation," instead of imparting a primordial knowledge of God, simply awakens into consciousness a pre-existing knowledge. With us who no longer witness the sensible revelations of God, but receive them only by tradition, it is obvious that the demonstration must be weakened rather than strengthened. Revelation, therefore, cannot possibly be a revelation of God's existence and attributes; and, in order that it may become efficient at all as a divine revelation, there must be an antecedent concept of the Being revealed. We come round, then, to the point from which we started. Whence this concept, and what is its meaning?

3. The argument from Immediate Intuition. As all men seem to themselves to know of the Divine, and are unconscious of any process or effort by which they have attained to this knowledge, have we not here a clear case of immediate intuition? To this question Jacobi and Schleiermacher and

But is such an argument a demonstration? It is, *if* the voice of humanity is the voice of truth. The conclusion hinges on the validity of a primitive, necessary belief. Is that which mankind universally and necessarily believe, to be taken as a presentation of the reality of things?

Let us see if it be possible to rise to a knowledge of God by any chain of thought which does not involve this link.

2. The argument from Direct Revelation. Here, it seems at *first*, is an unimpeachable demonstration. But suppose ourselves in a position to witness the immediate manifestations of the Divine presence, and to listen to the audible voice of God, what proof have we that the phenomenon is not an illusion of our senses? or that any of our sensations are not illusory? We receive an impression upon our sensorium, and *believe* because we must; but that is all. What sanction has our belief? Next, suppose we had the best of grounds for asserting the reality of something making the external manifestation, how could we know that reality to be such as mankind conceives the nature of God to be? Without an antecedent notion of God the sensible manifestation could only announce itself as a finite phenomenon. Whence the notions of intelligence, goodness, infinity, rising up in the soul in presence of a finite phenomenon? This "revelation," instead of imparting a primordial knowledge of God, simply awakens into consciousness a pre-existing knowledge. With us who no longer witness the sensible revelations of God, but receive them only by tradition, it is obvious that the demonstration must be weakened rather than strengthened. Revelation, therefore, cannot possibly be a revelation of God's existence and attributes; and, in order that it may become efficient at all as a *divine* revelation, there must be an antecedent concept of the Being revealed. We come round, then, to the point from which we started. Whence this concept, and what is its meaning?

3. The argument from Immediate Intuition. As all men seem to themselves to know of the Divine, and are unconscious of any process or effort by which they have attained to this knowledge, have we not here a clear case of immediate intuition? To this question Jacobi and Schleiermacher and

many others respond affirmatively. This is probably the meaning of the theism of Hamilton and Mansel; and no other theism was possible to Kant without virtual self-contradiction. We refer to the pages of Dr. Cocker for an exposition and criticism of this philosophy; but for ourselves, we feel like confessing a leaning toward it. We cannot here argue the point; nor do we wish to intimate that there is not another avenue of approach to the theistic concept. We believe there is. But here we are confronted still by the old question. Consciousness reports directly (in this view) the reality of the Divine, and we irresistibly believe the report. Now, what authority has consciousness to report thus? Does the presence of this necessary belief imply a Reality? We must make a further effort to flank this difficulty.

4. The ætiological argument. We turn here into the domain of necessary ideas. We place our feet on the principle of universal causality, and rise from the observation of contingent causes to the concept of primordial causation. This concept is a revelation of causation adequate to the formation of the world and all the visible or conceivable universe. But as nothing, quantitatively considered, can be infinite, but only *indefinite*, this principle does not lift us up to infinite causation. The power is not that of an Absolute Cause, but only a World-maker, a Demiurge, and this does not answer to the human conception of Deity. But further, the argument only bears us to the necessary *idea* of primary causality; and though we do, indeed, discover beyond this the necessary *idea* of Absolute Cause—Self-Existence—it furnishes us no means to bridge the gulf between necessary ideas and necessary realities. True, the reason supplies us with the means of passing from mode to subject, but this is extraneous to the purlieus of the present argument. This method, therefore, of itself, breaks off before reaching our objective point; and, moreover, it will be noted that whatever the uses to which it may be put, its validity rests again on the trustworthiness of that judgment of reason which affirms that *every effect must have a cause.* What sanction has reason for affirming this judgment? What validity appertains to our belief in the principle of causality? Let us make another tack.

5. The Teleological argument. Restricting this to cases of

many others respond affirmatively. This is probably th meaning of the theism of Hamilton and Mansel; and no othe theism was possible to Kant without virtual self-contradiction. We refer to the pages of Dr. Caird for an exposition and criticism of this philosophy; but for ourselves, we feel its confessing a longing toward it. We cannot here argue the point; nor do we wish to intimate that there is not another avenue of approach to the theistic concept. We believe there is. But here we are confronted still by the old question. Consciousness reports directly (in this view) the reality of th Divine, and we irresistibly believe the report. Now, wh authority has consciousness to report thus? Does the pre ence of this necessary belief imply a Reality? We must mak a further effort to flank this difficulty.

4. The aetiological argument. We turn here into the do main of necessary ideas. We place our feet on the principle of universal causality, and rise from the observation of con tingent causes to the concept of primordial causation. This concept is a revelation of causation adequate to the formation of the world and all the visible or conceivable universe. But as nothing, quantitatively considered, can be infinite, but only indefinite, this principle does not lift us up to infinite causation. The power is not that of an Absolute Cause, but only a World-maker, a Demiurge, and this does not answer to the human conception of Deity. But further, the argument only bears us to the necessary idea of primary causality; and though we do, indeed, discover beyond this the necessary idea of Absolute Cause—Self-Existence—it furnishes us no means to bridge the gulf between necessary ideas and necessary realities. True, the reason supplies us with the means of passing from mode to subject, but this is extraneous to the purlieus of the present argument. This method, therefore, of itself, breaks off before reaching our objective point; and, moreover, it will be noted that whatever the uses to which it may be put, its validity rests again on the trustworthiness of that judgment of reason which affirms that every effect must have a cause. What sanction has reason for affirming this judgment? What validity appertains to our belief in the principle of causality? Let us make another test.

5. The Teleological argument. Restricting this to cases of

correlation of the mechanical sort, we affirm that the contrivances discoverable in nature proclaim intelligence operative in nature. Here we are met at the threshold by the objection that we know nothing about *designs* in nature;* and the only reply we can make is, that we feel fully persuaded that contrivance implies intention, and, therefore, intelligence, and that we feel this necessity to be the same in the domain of nature as in that of humanity. Still it is only a primitive belief. But there is a further difficulty. The evidence carries us, at best, only to the idea of necessary intelligence as the adequate explanation of the mechanism of the universe. This, again, apart from any other proof, is not infinite intelligence, but only intelligence *indefinite* in degree—such intelligence as is demanded by the system of nature; and, in addition, it is only *intelligence* and nothing more. The argument does not lead us to the idea of being and personality; and so, like the preceding argument, it leaves faith dangling in mid-heaven and groping around desperately for a firm support. We hasten to the next alternative.

6. The Homological † argument. As this phrase is a stranger in the present category, we explain the meaning to be an argument based on proofs of intelligence drawn from the existence of intelligible methods—plans—in nature. We need not amplify the explanation or the argument. It is at once apparent that, however convincing the proofs of intelligence, the argument lands us exactly where the teleological did, and faith feels itself afloat without an anchorage.

7. The Ontological argument. Here we deal with essential realities—the ground and source of all cognizable modes and attributes, whether contingent or uncontingent. We find in our minds the necessary idea of existence, reality, and feel impelled to predicate a necessary *something* distinct from the world, and which constitutes the ground and reason of its existence. This is the *only* argument furnished by reason which

---

* This "conclusion [that design is revealed in nature] could not bear, perhaps, the strictest transcendental critique;" Kant: "Critique of Pure Reason," p. 435. This objection is echoed and re-echoed in the pages of Hamilton, Spencer, and others.

† This is the Cosmological argument of Cocker, or a branch of the Physico-Theological of Kant.

correlation of the mechanical sort, we affirm that the contrivances discoverable in nature proclaim intelligence operative in nature. Here we are met at the threshold by the objection that we know nothing about designs in nature;* and the only reply we can make is, that we feel fully persuaded that contrivance implies intention, and, therefore, intelligence, and that we feel this necessity to be the same in the domain of nature as in that of humanity. Still it is only a primitive belief. But there is a further difficulty. The evidence carries us, at best, only to the idea of necessary intelligence as the adequate explanation of the mechanism of the universe. This, again, apart from any other proof, is not infinite intelligence, but only intelligence *indefinite* in degree—such intelligence as is demanded by the system of nature; and, in addition, it is only *intelligence* and nothing more. The argument does not lead us to the idea of being and personality; and so, like the preceding argument, it leaves faith dangling in mid-heaven and groping around desperately for a firm support. We hasten to the next alternative.

6. The Hermeological† argument. As this phrase is a stranger in the present category, we explain the meaning to be an argument based on proofs of intelligence drawn from the existence of intelligible methods—plans—in nature. We need not amplify the explanation or the argument. It is at once apparent that, however convincing the proofs of intelligence, the argument lands us exactly where the teleological did, and faith feels itself afloat without an anchorage.

7. The Ontological argument. Here we deal with essential realities—the ground and source of all cognizable modes and attributes, whether contingent or uncontingent. We find in our minds the necessary idea of existence, reality, and feel impelled to predicate a necessary something distinct from the world, and which constitutes the ground and reason of its existence. This is the only argument furnished by reason which

---

* This "conclusion [that design is revealed in nature] would set them [writers] the hardest transcendental subject." Kant: "Critique of Pure Reason," p. 491. This objection is stated and re-echoed in the pages of Hamilton, Mansel, and others.

† This is the Cosmological argument of Cousin, or a branch of the Physico-Theological of Kant.

attains to real being. There are three orders of cognizable manifestations, giving rise to three corresponding orders of ontological concepts.

I. Phenomena of the Objectivity, (extension, form, color, etc.) Ontological principles, applied to these phenomena, supply a form of real being, which is contingent, *finite*, and MATERIAL.

II. Phenomena of the Subjectivity, (the mental states.) Ontological principles, applied to these phenomena, supply a form of real being which is self-conscious, free, intelligent, moral, and IMMATERIAL, but still *finite* and *conditioned.*

III. Necessary Ideas. These are not properly phenomena of mind. The consciousness of their presence is such. No phenomena of the finite can claim a necessary existence. Some of the necessary ideas which reason discovers in its domain are the following: The ideas of, 1. Substance or Reality. 2. Causality, with its derivatives, Will, Liberty, Motivity, and Intelligence. 3. Intelligence. 4. Ethicality, (the idea of right and wrong.) 5. Duty. 6. Personality. 7. Unity. 8. Infinity. 9. Absolutivity. (Perhaps the 7th and 9th are also derivable from the idea of causality. Kant says Liberty is not directly cognized, but only a deduction from the concept of Duty, and deriving its objective, real existence from the reality of Duty; but in this he contradicts himself and the verdict of common consciousness.)

Ontological principles, applied to the existence of necessary ideas, supply necessary, *infinite*, and *unconditioned* Being as their subject. Therefore, the ontological argument shows that *if* necessary ideas exist, there is a necessary subject to which they must be referred as their adequate cause and ground. But there *are* necessary ideas:

(1.) Arising spontaneously in our own minds in presence of the phenomena of the external world, but transcending all which we can conceive of the extent, duration, or degrees of contingent existence, and clothing themselves with the attribute of absolutivity. Such are our transcendental ideas of substantivity, causality, intelligence, etc.

(2.) Further illustrated and emphasized by a thoughtful contemplation of the Kosmos. For instance:

Intelligence is exemplified in (*a*) Relations of *contrivance*, attains to real being. There are three orders of cognized manifestations, giving rise to three corresponding orders of ontological concepts.

I. Phenomena of the Objectivity, (extension, form, color, etc.) Ontological principles, applied to these phenomena, supply a form of real being, which is contingent, finite, and MATERIAL.

II. Phenomena of the Subjectivity, (the mental states.) Ontological principles, applied to these phenomena, supply a form of real being which is self-conscious, free, intelligent, moral, and IMMATERIAL, but still *finite* and *conditioned*.

III. Necessary Ideas. These are not properly phenomena of mind. The consciousness of their presence is such. No phenomena of the finite can claim a necessary existence. Some of the necessary Ideas which reason discovers in its domain are the following: The ideas of, 1. Substance or Reality. 2. Causality, with its derivatives, Will, Liberty, Motivity, and Intelligence. 3. Intelligence. 4. Ethicality, (the idea of right and wrong.) 5. Duty. 6. Personality. 7. Unity. 8. Infinity. 9. Absolutivity. (Perhaps the 7th and 8th are also derivable from the idea of causality. Kant says Liberty is not directly cognized, but only a deduction from the concept of Duty, and deriving its objective, real existence from the reality of Duty; but in this he contradicts himself and the verdict of common consciousness.)

Ontological principles, applied to the existence of necessary ideas, supply necessary, *infinite*, and *unconditioned* Being as their subject. Therefore, the ontological argument shows that *if* necessary ideas exist, there is a necessary subject to which they must be referred as their adequate cause and ground. But there are necessary ideas:

(1.) Arising spontaneously in our own minds in presence of the phenomena of the external world, but transcending all which we can conceive of the extent, duration, or degree of contingent existence, and clothing themselves with the attribute of absolutivity. Such are our transcendental ideas of substantiality, causality, intelligence, etc.

(2.) Further illustrated and emphasized by a thoughtful contemplation of the Kosmos. For instance:

Intelligence is exemplified in (*a*) Relations of contrivance, (the Teleological proof;) (*b*) Relations of *plan*, (the Homological proof.)

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{Primordial Causality and its derivatives}\\ \text{Unity,}\\ \left.\begin{array}{l}\text{Motivity,}\\ \text{Self-determination,}\\ \text{Self-consciousness,}\end{array}\right\} = \text{Personality,}\end{array}\right\}\text{ are exemplified in}$$

relations of cause and effect, (the *Ætiological* proof.)

These three, and other* similar modes of argumentation, thus contribute *predicates*, which the Ontological argument affirms of *Real Being*. These predicates, together with those supplied directly and spontaneously by the mind, make up the whole possible conception of *Perfect Being*, or DEITY.

Finally, we desire to direct attention to the fact that on whatever ultimate the last predicate of reason rests, we are obliged to accept it—though we do it cheerfully and necessarily—simply because the denial of it appears absurd. Simple, primitive belief, therefore, is the very root of the highest certainty attainable.

Must we, then, confess that all our knowledge rests on a basis which admits of doubt? Never was a more important question raised in the whole annals of humanity. It is of supreme importance to discern the absolute and irrecusable validity of the primitive beliefs. They are the molecules of philosophy. In the last analysis of our knowledge we find an element which we hesitate to pronounce knowledge, because it is only belief; and we are not satisfied to pronounce it belief, because we feel that it is knowledge. All our knowledge resolves itself into primitive judgments which we affirm, because we intuit, *the reality*. Intuitive knowledge is identical with primitive belief, and philosophy is but a deduction from intuitive knowledge.

It was not our purpose to attempt to enforce the authority of the primitive beliefs, but merely to point them out as the

---

* Similarly we might frame an *Ethical* argument, based on the principles of ethicality as major, and the demonstrations of justice in the world as minor, premise; also an *Agathological* argument, based on the idea of goodness and its manifestations in nature. But these arguments, guided by nature, reach only to *indefinite* intelligence, causality, justice, and goodness, when we are obliged to turn to the reason to furnish the concepts of *absolute* attributes; and still another effort of reason is demanded to view these absolutes as modes of Being.

key-stones of human knowledge, and to remind the reader that *the impeachment of one is the dethronement of all.* To attack the authority of the belief in efficient causality is not only to launch us upon a universe of chance, but to surround us, as Fichte confessed, by a phantasmagoria of unrealities and illusions. To dishonor our belief in Absolute Being as the ground of our necessary idea of Absolute Being, is, by a fell touch, to break the electric communication which unites the world of finite existence with the realm of eternal Realities, and plunge the unhappy soul into the abyss of nihilism. On the contrary, to assert the authority of our belief in the reality either of the external world or of the world within ourselves, is, by implication, to announce the authority of that universal faith of humanity which affirms Supreme Divinity; it is to recognize intelligence, power, goodness, justice, in the ordinations of the visible universe, and to make these attributes the predicates of the Absolute and Perfect Being revealed in the inmost chamber of human reason.

Art. VI.—THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA: ITS STATUS AND ITS FIELD.

> "When a great country scatters in some vast and fertile wilderness the seeds of a civilized population, fosters and protects the infant community through the period of helplessness, and rears it into a mighty nation, the measure is not only beneficial to mankind, but may answer as a mercantile speculation."—Macaulay's Essays.

As we have arrived at the semi-centennial anniversary of the landing of the first Negro colonists from the United States on the shores of Liberia, and their occupation of Cape Mesurado—which events took place January 7, 1822, and April 25, 1822—we have thought it a fitting time to take a brief survey of those operations which have succeeded in rearing from a feeble beginning an independent, sovereign community on the western coast of Africa. We have before us the "Memorial of the American Colonization Society," published in 1867, at the close of the first fifty years of its labors. It contains the following articles: Minutes of the Fiftieth Annual Meeting; Address of the President of the Society, J. H. B. Latrobe;

Selections from the Annual Report; Address of President Warner of Liberia; Historical Discourse by Dr. Joseph Tracy; Address by Bishop Clark, followed by an Appendix containing the Liberian Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the first President's Inaugural, showing affairs as they appeared then, and the President's Annual Message for 1866, showing matters as they are now. Also, a table of Chief Magistrates, table of emigrants, and table of the annual receipts of the Society since its organization.

It was quite fitting that Dr. Joseph Tracy, the venerable Secretary of the Massachusetts Colonization Society, should have been selected to deliver the Historical Discourse. Possessed of a mind disciplined by New England culture, of remarkable patience of research, with singular affection for every detail of colonization and Liberian history, and an extraordinary capacity of collecting and treasuring them, he has accu mulated a minute and special knowledge of Liberia, her origin, condition, and necessities, equal to, and in many respects surpassing, that of the oldest and most intelligent Liberian.

Dr. Tracy informs us that the origin of the idea of colonizing blacks from the United States in Africa cannot be attributed to any single individual. "The sentiment gushed forth at many points, so that many persons have been named as the originators of the enterprise." But prominent among those to whom the credit belongs of having promulgated the idea of "a definite plan for a colony, with its agricultural, mechanical, and commercial interests, are Rev. Samuel Hopkins and Rev. Ezra Stiles of Newport, R. I., and Dr. William Thornton, 'a young man from the West Indies.'"

The close of the administration of James Madison witnessed the inauguration of the colonization scheme. The country had just begun to recover from the depression occasioned by the war with England. A political campaign was just over, and a spirit of hopefulness for the future had begun to be felt by the American people. It was a fit time for the founding of a great association, which, having for its object the promotion of the highest philanthropic and political ends, was destined to unite men of all parties.

For more than one hundred and fifty years the transatlantic

African slave-trade was carried on with the approbation or consent of the whole Christian world, and Africa poured forth her sons by scores of thousands to do the labor and drudgery of the western world.

The time was now drawing near for the deliverance of this suffering race. Men of prudent foresight, contemplating the justice of God, began to tremble for a country in which an innocent people were subjected to labor so constant, and to mental and physical influences so degrading. They felt the premonitory currents of a coming storm, and contended that measures should be adopted for the amelioration of the condition of the negroes, and the removal from the land of an institution which was exercising a blighting influence upon its moral and industrial energies. But among these sympathizers with the Negro there were conflicting views as to the manner in which, compatibly with the welfare of all concerned, the desired object could be secured. Two parties arose, one contending for a gradual abolition of slavery, with a simultaneous removal of the free blacks from the United States; the other demanding immediate and unconditional emancipation. The unconditional Abolitionists went forth throughout the country and denounced in energetic terms the holding of men in bondage. The other party, including in its ranks many of the best friends of the Negro, felt it their duty also to testify against the gigantic evil. But they chose a different method. They saw that slavery was a Gordian knot, which could not be so easily cut as their more sanguine and impetuous opponents supposed; that it must be untied with infinite labor and skill. And because of the vigorous energy of the powerful party opposed to them, the Colonizationists felt obliged to repress their own feelings in deference to the terrible issues which the question involved. But they went to work with commendable zeal and earnestness in behalf of the Negro.

There was not wanting those in the South, and even in the North—a large and influential class sympathizing with neither of the two parties—who denied the manhood of the Negro, his fitness for freedom and self-government; maintaining with wonderful perversion of Scripture that God, having fixed the curse of Canaan upon all the descendants of Ham, or at least upon that portion of them occupying the African continent, African slave-trade was carried on with the approbation or consent of the whole Christian world, and Africa poured forth her sons by scores of thousands to do the labor and drudgery of the western world.

The time was now drawing near for the deliverance of this suffering race. Men of prudent foresight, contemplating the justice of God, began to tremble for a country in which an innocent people were subjected to labor so constant, and to mental and physical influences so degrading. They felt the premonitory currents of a coming storm, and contended that measures should be adopted for the amelioration of the condition of the negroes, and the removal from the land of an institution which was exercising a blighting influence upon its moral and industrial energies. But among these sympathizers with the Negro there were conflicting views as to the manner in which, compatibly with the welfare of all concerned, the desired object could be secured. Two parties arose, one contending for a gradual abolition of slavery, with a simultaneous removal of the free blacks from the United States; the other demanding immediate and unconditional emancipation. The unconditional Abolitionists went forth throughout the country and denounced in energetic terms the holding of men in bondage. The other party, including in its ranks many of the best friends of the Negro, felt it their duty also to testify against the gigantic evil. But they chose a different method. They saw that slavery was a Gordian knot, which could not be so easily cut as their more sanguine and impetuous opponents supposed; that it must be untied with infinite labor and skill. And because of the vigorous energy of the powerful party opposed to them, the Colonizationists felt obliged to repress their own feelings in deference to the terrible issues which the question involved. But they went to work with commendable zeal and earnestness in behalf of the Negro.

There was not wanting those in the South, and even in the North—a large and influential class sympathizing with neither of the two parties—who denied the manhood of the Negro, his fitness for freedom and self-government; maintaining with wonderful perversion of Scripture that God, having fixed the curse of Canaan upon all the descendants of Ham, or at least upon that portion of them occupying the African continent, unto the latest generation, the institution of American slavery was essentially righteous and signally beneficent.*

This horrible doctrine Colonizationists did not believe; but they saw that it was impossible effectually to disprove the unphilosophical and unchristian theory so long as the Negro remained under the depressing influences of a dominating race. They sought, therefore, by removing those already free, or who might become free, from such cramping circumstances, and placing them in their own fatherland, where they would have the opportunity of confuting, not by noisy argument and violent declamation, but by practical demonstration, *solvitur ambulando*, the unhallowed dogma of their enemies, to remove a formidable objection to the freedom of the race.

To carry out this object, they organized in the city of Washington, in the months of December and January, 1816–17, the "American Colonization Society." The Abolition party did not institute any regular organization until several years afterward; but their influence was felt all over the country, especially among the free colored people in the Middle and Eastern States. As soon as the Colonization Society was organized, they assailed it with a vigor and determination that very rapidly created a public sentiment against it. The colored people held a public meeting in the city of Philadelphia in the month of January, 1817, immediately after the Colonization Society was organized, and passed the following among other resolutions:

> *Resolved*, That we NEVER will separate ourselves voluntarily from the slave population in this country; they are OUR *brethren* by the ties of *consanguinity*, of *suffering*, and of *wrong*, and we feel that there is *more* virtue in suffering privations with them than in fancied enjoyments for a season.

About the year 1832 the Abolition party organized the American Antislavery Society—a *nom de guerre*—which enlisted under their banner nearly all the blacks of the North, and secured the confidence of a number of non-partisan philanthropists in the United States and England. The two parties, now in organized form and in singular and uncompromising hostility to each other, went on with their work; and, from their peculiar modes of operation, attracted to their ranks men whose personal temperaments suited the one or the other.

---

* Greeley's "American Conflict," vol. i, p. 73.

unto the latest generation, the institution of American slavery was essentially righteous and signally beneficent.*

This horrible doctrine Colonizationists did not believe; but they saw that it was impossible effectually to disprove the unphilosophical and unchristian theory so long as the Negro remained under the depressing influences of a dominating race. They sought, therefore, by removing those already free, or who might become free, from such cramping circumstances, and placing them in their own fatherland, where they would have the opportunity of confuting, not by noisy argument and violent declamation, but by practical demonstration, *solvitur ambulando*, the unhallowed dogma of their enemies, to remove a formidable objection to the freedom of the race.

To carry out this object, they organized in the city of Washington, in the months of December and January, 1816–17, the "American Colonization Society." The Abolition party did not institute any regular organization until several years afterward; but their influence was felt all over the country, especially among the free colored people in the Middle and Eastern States. As soon as the Colonization Society was organized, they assailed it with a vigor and determination that very rapidly created a public sentiment against it. The colored people held a public meeting in the city of Philadelphia in the month of January, 1817, immediately after the Colonization Society was organized, and passed the following among other resolutions:

> *Resolved*, That we NEVER will separate ourselves voluntarily from the slave population in this country; they are our *brethren* by the ties of *consanguinity*, of *suffering*, and of *wrong*, and we feel that there is more virtue in suffering privations with them than in fancied enjoyments for a season.

About the year 1832 the Abolition party organized the American Antislavery Society—a *nom de guerre*—which enlisted under their banner nearly all the blacks of the North, and secured the confidence of a number of non-partisan philanthropists in the United States and England. The two parties, now in organized form and in singular and uncompromising hostility to each other, went on with their work; and, from their peculiar modes of operation, attracted to themselves men whose personal temperaments suited the one or the other.

---

* Greeley's "American Conflict," vol. i, p. 73.

They whose earnestness for the welfare of the Negro developed itself in quiet action and sympathy, connected themselves with the Colonization Society. They whose restlessness for the destruction of slavery allowed them no repose, but sent them rushing forward to abate the evil without regard to consequences, joined the Abolitionists. Many of the latter were men of strong principles, warm hearts, and expansive sympathies; but nature had endowed them with strong aggressive propensities. William Lloyd Garrison and Gerrit Smith in their early manhood were ardent supporters of Colonization; but the Society did not allow sufficient scope for the vehemence of their natures. It would have been just as impossible to confine such men as Garrison, Gerrit Smith, Wendell Phillips, and Henry Ward Beecher—men overflowing with intense eagerness of soul, and peculiarly fitted for the work they achieved—within the Colonization ranks, as it would be to confine the hurricanes of the West Indies to any given parallel of latitude.

> "Their breath is agitation, and their life
> A storm whereon they ride."

These men believed that, having come to the conclusion that an institution is wrong, inimical to the progress of man, they must hate it with perfect hatred, and go at it with sword and scimeter, like the great Arabian reformer. The antislavery agitation was a work affording scope for all their energy and eloquence. They brought to their delicate, difficult, and thankless task an earnestness and ability equaled only by the courage with which they vindicated their progressive views. It must be counted for no inconsiderable feat of moral heroism on their part that they came forward at a time when scorn, reproach, disgrace, lynch-law, and even death, were the reward of those who ventured to promulgate abolition doctrines. To persist day after day, month after month, and year after year, under such circumstances, in the advocacy of the cause of the poor and helpless, demanded a strength of endurance and a degree of mettle not found in men uninspired by lofty principles.

On the other hand, no amount of reasoning could have induced the Alexanders of Princeton, Edward Everett, or Ralph Randolph Gurley of Washington, to join the crusade of

the Abolitionists. Not that they were deficient in what is sometimes called nerve; but their mental constitution and temperament forbade it. It was theirs to accomplish another, though a cognate work. Essentially conservative, they distrusted the wisdom and ability, as well as moderation, of the Abolition party. They believed with Burke in the gradual progress, the natural growth of the body social and political. Deeply sympathizing in the sufferings of the wronged and unhappy Negro, as full of enthusiasm for his deliverance as the Abolitionists, as keen in their perception of the right and the just, they nevertheless thought that to secure freedom and permanent rescue for the object of their sympathy it was wiser to trust to slower, more regular, and, in their opinion, more legitimate influences, which would operate without disturbing society, without compelling a powerful counter-agitation, and inducing such reactionary measures as would inevitably lead to civil war. Among them, too, not a few looked upon slavery as one of those evils which Divine Providence does not leave to be remedied by human contrivances, but which, in its own good time, by some means impossible to be anticipated, but by the simplest and easiest operation, when all its uses shall have been fulfilled, shall vanish like a dream.*

With these views, they considered that the Colonization Society, by its gentle and quiet manner of proceeding toward the desired end, presented a more suitable and productive field for their efforts.

But a large number of philanthropists, both in the United States and in England, who took no active part with either society, looked upon the colonization enterprise as a movement sound to a certain extent in principle, and possibly beneficent in result, but suggested by motives of questionable justice or morality. They were ready to admit that, considered in itself, the transfer of Negroes from the United States to Africa for the purpose of providing for themselves and their posterity an asylum of liberty, suppress the slave-trade, and civilize their heathen brethren, was undeniably a good thing. It was only the carrying out of a wise and humane policy inaugurated long before by great and good men. But, owing to the unfortunate eloquence of some of the friends of the Society, employed the Abolitionists. Not that they were deficient in what is sometimes called nerve; but their mental constitution and temperament forbade it. It was theirs to accomplish another, though a cognate work. Essentially conservative, they distrusted the wisdom and ability, as well as moderation, of the Abolition party. They believed with Burke in the gradual progress, the natural growth of the body social and political. Deeply sympathizing in the sufferings of the wronged and unhappy Negro, as full of enthusiasm for his deliverance as the Abolitionists, as keen in their perception of the right and the just, they nevertheless thought that to secure freedom and permanent rescue for the object of their sympathy it was wiser to trust to slower, more regular, and, in their opinion, more legitimate influences, which would operate without disturbing society, without compelling a powerful counter-agitation, and inducing such reactionary measures as would inevitably lead to civil war. Among them, too, not a few looked upon slavery as one of those evils which Divine Providence does not leave to be remedied by human contrivances, but which, in its own good time, by some means impossible to be anticipated, but by the simplest and easiest operation, when all its uses shall have been fulfilled, shall vanish like a dream.*

---

* See Dr. Hodge's Article on Emancipation, "Princeton Review," Oct., 1849.

With these views, they considered that the Colonization Society, by its gentle and quiet manner of proceeding toward the desired end, presented a more suitable and productive field for their efforts.

But a large number of philanthropists, both in the United States and in England, who took no active part with either society, looked upon the colonization enterprise as a movement sound to a certain extent in principle, and possibly beneficent in result, but suggested by motives of questionable justice or morality. They were ready to admit that, considered in itself, the transfer of Negroes from the United States to Africa for the purpose of providing for themselves and their posterity an asylum of liberty, suppress the slave-trade, and civilize their heathen brethren, was undeniably a good thing. It was only the carrying out of a wise and humane policy inaugurated long before by great and good men. But, owing to the injudicious eloquence of some of the friends of the society, suspected more especially, perhaps, to influence slaveholders and gain their support in the cause of gradual emancipation, many who took no pains to investigate the matter became settled in the belief that the Colonization Society was an engine of oppression and wrong; that its organization was dictated in the main by certain ulterior designs and concealed motives in the minds of its advocates, whom they regarded with contempt for not being frank enough to avow their sentiments in an open and straightforward manner.* For the assertions of some of its friends the Society was of course not responsible; but they were sufficient in the hands of its active opponents, to make for colonization permanent enemies among blacks and whites.

---

* See Dr. Hodge's Article on Emancipation, "Princeton Review," Oct., 1849.

But are we to suppose that there was no benevolence in the hearts of the scores of slaveholders in the South, who not only advocated the cause of the Society, but liberated and sent their slaves to Liberia? Are we to suppose that selfishness was the motive, the only motive, that prompted their action? And must we believe that there was a want of honest principle in the course pursued by the Society in admitting to its ranks men of all shades of political opinion? Was there a dereliction of duty? Let us look at the matter calmly and dispassionately. Their aim was to reach the blacks throughout the whole country, and to secure the emigration of a large number, if not the majority of them, to Africa. Was it wrong in them, with this object in view, to secure for their cause the confidence and cooperation of such men as Bushrod Washington, Charles Carroll, James Madison, John Randolph, and Henry Clay, as well as of distinguished men of the North? We cannot see that it was. Moreover, in point of education, of refinement, and of intellectual culture, the South was not to be despised. The governing classes of the land were largely drawn from that more especially, perhaps, to influence slaveholders, and gain their support in the cause of gradual emancipation, many who took no pains to investigate the matter became settled in the belief that the Colonization Society was an engine of oppression and wrong; that its organization was dictated in the main by certain ulterior designs and concealed motives in the minds of its advocates, whom they regarded with contempt for not being frank enough to avow their sentiments in an open and straightforward manner.* For the assertions of some of its friends the Society was of course not responsible; but they were sufficient in the hands of its active opponents, to make for colonization permanent enemies among blacks and whites.

---

*See Greeley's "American Conflict," vol. i, page 72, and Garrison's "Thoughts on Colonization." As late as July, 1856, the "Westminster Review" remarked that "Liberia was founded in and of slavery; for the sake of slavery it has been kept alive, and with slavery in America its African offspring will disappear. It lives by the preponderance of a pro-slavery policy at home, and the reversal of that policy will extinguish it. We do not know a more striking instance of the direction of a temporary social perturbation into a missionary channel." And we may add, that we do not know a more striking instance than the above paragraph of the erratic action of a gifted brain and a mighty hand clouded by willful ignorance and hampered by prejudice.

But are we to suppose that there was no benevolence in the hearts of the scores of slaveholders in the South, who not only advocated the cause of the Society, but liberated and sent their slaves to Liberia? Are we to suppose that selfishness was the motive, the only motive, that prompted their action? Then must we believe that there was a want of honest principle in the course pursued by the Society in admitting to its ranks men of all shades of political opinion? Was there a dereliction of duty? Let us look at the matter calmly and dispassionately. Their aim was to reach the blacks throughout the whole country, and to secure the emigration of a large number, if not the majority of them, to Africa. Was it wrong in them, with this object in view, to secure for their cause the confidence and co-operation of such men as Bushrod Washington, Charles Carroll, James Madison, John Randolph, and Henry Clay, as well as of distinguished men of the North? We cannot see that it was. Moreover, in point of education, of refinement, and of intellectual culture, the South was not to be despised. The governing classes of the land were largely drawn from that quarter. Besides, the Society, being poor, placed great reliance upon the friendly co-operation of the General Government in affording pecuniary assistance for commencing their operation and fostering their colony on the African coast. Had their movements been so conducted as to deprive them of the sympathies of Southern society and the countenance of the educated classes, it would have been worse than useless to hope for assistance from the Government. As an African, we surely cannot withhold the tribute of our unfeigned admiration and gratitude from the men who went forth with drawn swords against the evil of slavery. It is to us unspeakably refreshing to watch them, in the annals of those times, wielding the tomahawk with such heartiness against the "peculiar institution." But, as a dispassionate spectator, we must contend that there was sound philosophy and practical wisdom in the course pursued by the Colonization Society. It would have been the reverse of prudent in them to begin their labors by ignoring the rights of slaveholders to their property—rights guaranteed by the laws of the land. This would not only have excited violent antagonism on the part of slaveholders, but would have exhibited so signal a divorce between judgment and benevolence, between discretion and energy, as would have alienated from their cause many earnest well-wishers of the Negro among non-slaveholders North and South, and thus led to a defeat of the object they had in view. Say what we please of lofty generosity and the power of truth, our dealings with the world convince us that where the interests of men are concerned abstract arguments of right and justice make very little headway. We remember in 1856, when the whole civilized world was startled by the outrage upon Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, by Preston Brooks, of South Carolina, the view taken of the matter by a philosophical statesman of a distant country.* He wrote: "People here speak of the outrage on Sumner as a proof of the brutal manners of the Americans, and their low morality. To me it seems the first blow in a civil war. If half England was in favor of a measure which involved the confiscation of the property of the other half, my belief is that an English Brooks would be equally applauded. If Peel had proposed a law which, instead of reducing rents, had annihilated

---

* See Greeley's "American Conflict," vol. i, page 77, and Garrison's "Thoughts on Colonization." As late as July, 1849, the "Westminster Review" asserted that "Liberia was founded in fear of slavery; for the sake of slavery it has been kept alive, and with slavery in America its African offspring will disappear. It lives by the preponderance of a pro-slavery policy at home, and the downfall of that policy will extinguish it. We do not know a more striking instance of the distortion of a generous social principle into a miserable [illegible]." We may add, that we do not know a more striking instance than the whole paragraph of the errant notion of a gifted brain and a mighty mind clouded by wilful ignorance and hampered by prejudice.

---

* Sir George Cornewall Lewis.

them, instead of being attacked by a man of words such as Disraeli, he would have been attacked with physical arguments by some man of blows."

But the Society, amid apprehensions and persecution, persevered in its efforts. It gained the sympathy of a large portion of the educated and influential classes; and so salutary was the impression which, by its energetic and judicious proceedings, had been produced upon the public mind, that the Board felt warranted, though without pecuniary resources, in taking preliminary steps for the formation of a colony on the west coast of Africa. They looked about for suitable men to visit the coast and select a proper site for the intended colony. Samuel J. Mills offered himself for that service, was accepted, and authorized to select his companion. He selected an intimate friend, Rev. Ebenezer Burgess, afterward Dr. Burgess, of Dedham, Mass., lately deceased, to whom he wrote as follows:

> I have been appointed by the Board of the Colonization Society as their agent in this noble expedition, and I am requested by them, if possible, to find a person who will engage in this mission with me. Will you go, Brother Burgess? My brother, can we engage in a nobler effort? We go to make freemen of slaves. We go to lay the foundation of a free and independent empire on the coast of poor degraded Africa!

After some consideration, Mr. Burgess consented to accompany his friend to Africa. Their letter of instructions was dated November 5, 1817. Money to defray the expense of the expedition was borrowed, and the loan repaid from funds raised by General Mercer and Rev. William Meade, afterward Bishop Meade, of Virginia.

Messrs. Mills and Burgess sailed for Africa November 16, taking England on their way. They reached the coast in the month of March following. After visiting Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Sherbro, they fixed upon the last-named place as a favorable location for the colony. They then returned to Sierra Leone, and thence sailed for the United States, where Mr. Burgess arrived October 22, 1818. Mr. Mills died on the passage. When he left home he was suffering from a pulmonary disease. The climate of England aggravated it. That of Africa suspended its operation, as it often does. A few days after leaving Sierra Leone it returned, aggravated by a severe them, instead of being attacked by a man of words such as Disraeli, he would have been attacked with physical arguments by some man of blows."

But the Society, amid apprehensions and persecution, persevered in its efforts. It gained the sympathy of a large portion of the educated and influential classes; and so salutary was the impression which, by its energetic and judicious proceedings, had been produced upon the public mind, that the Board felt warranted, though without pecuniary resources, in taking preliminary steps for the formation of a colony on the west coast of Africa. They looked about for suitable men to visit the coast and select a proper site for the intended colony. Samuel J. Mills offered himself for that service, was accepted, and authorized to select his companion. He selected an intimate friend, Rev. Ebenezer Burgess, afterward Dr. Burgess, of Dedham, Mass., lately deceased, to whom he wrote as follows:

> I have been appointed by the Board of the Colonization Society as their agent in this noble expedition, and I am requested by them, if possible, to find a person who will engage in this mission with me. Will you go, Brother Burgess? My brother, can we engage in a nobler effort? We go to make freemen of slaves. We go to lay the foundation of a free and independent empire on the coast of poor degraded Africa!

After some consideration, Mr. Burgess consented to accompany his friend to Africa. Their letter of instructions was dated November 5, 1817. Money to defray the expenses of the expedition was borrowed, and the loan repaid from funds raised by General Mercer and Rev. William Meade, afterward Bishop Meade, of Virginia.

Messrs. Mills and Burgess sailed for Africa November 16, taking England on their way. They reached the coast in the month of March following. After visiting Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Sherbro, they fixed upon the last-named place as a favorable location for the colony. They then returned to Sierra Leone, and thence sailed for the United States, where Mr. Burgess arrived October 22, 1818. Mr. Mills died on the passage. When he left home he was suffering from a pulmonary disease. The climate of England aggravated it. That of Africa suspended its operation, as it often does. A few days after leaving Sierra Leone it returned, aggravated by a severe cold, and on the 16th day of June he gently expired, and at sunset his body was committed to the ocean.*

Encouraged by the representations of their surviving agent, the Society determined to lay the foundations of their colony as soon as possible, and for this purpose made great exertions to fit out an expedition immediately. On the 6th of February, 1820, the ship "Elizabeth" sailed from New York with eighty-six emigrants, and arrived at Sierra Leone March 9. Thence they were transferred to Campelar, Sherbro Island, March 20. After various disappointments and disasters, the emigrants, under the superintendence of Dr. Eli Ayres, succeeded in obtaining a foothold on Cape Mesurado, in lat. 6° 19′ N., long. 10° 49′ W., where now stands Monrovia, the capital of the Republic of Liberia.

The purchase of the Mesurado territory was effected in December of 1821, of which transaction a particular account was published by the Colonization Society a few months afterward. The tract ceded included Cape Mesurado and the lands, forming nearly a peninsula, between the Mesurado and Junk rivers, about thirty-six miles along the coast, with an average breadth of about two miles. For a hundred years the principal powers of Europe had in vain tried to gain possession of Cape Mesurado. France and England had made repeated offers to the head chiefs occupying the territory, who steadily and invariably refused to part with even one acre. Indeed, the kings were known to be extremely hostile to the whites, always rejecting their most advantageous proposals.† Thus was this territory providentially reserved for Africa's own descendants, far away in exile.

Near the mouth of the Mesurado river are two small islands, containing together less than three acres. The larger of these islands was, at the time the colonists arrived, nearly covered with houses built in the native style, and occupied by a famcold, and on the 10th day of June he gently expired, and at sunset his body was committed to the ocean.*

---

* Tracy's Historical Discourse.

† White traders have left along this coast so dark and sanguinary a record that among many of the tribes no deeper insult can be offered by a man to his neighbor than calling him a white man. Bishop Payne, of Cape Palmas, informed the writer that the greatest compliment a Grebo can pay to a European is to call him a *black man.* "You be black man, sir," said a member of that tribe when trying to express his admiration of the Bishop. They call a white man *Kubwe*, or *little demon.*

Encouraged by the representations of their surviving agent, the Society determined to lay the foundations of their colony as soon as possible, and for this purpose made great exertions to fit out an expedition immediately. On the 6th of February, 1820, the ship "Elizabeth" sailed from New York with eighty-six emigrants, and arrived at Sierra Leone March 9. Thence they were transferred to Campelar, Sherbro Island, March 20. After various disappointments and disasters, the emigrants, under the superintendence of Dr. Eli Ayres, succeeded in obtaining a foothold on Cape Mesurado, in lat. 6° 19' N., long. 10° 48' W., where now stands Monrovia, the capital of the Republic of Liberia.

The purchase of the Mesurado territory was effected in December of 1821, of which transaction a particular account was published by the Colonization Society a few months afterward. The tract ceded included Cape Mesurado and the lands, forming nearly a peninsula, between the Mesurado and Junk rivers, about thirty-six miles along the coast, with an average breadth of about two miles. For a hundred years the principal powers of Europe had in vain tried to gain possession of Cape Mesurado. France and England had made repeated offers to the head chiefs occupying the territory, who steadily and invariably refused to part with even one acre. Indeed, the Kings were known to be extremely hostile to the whites, always rejecting their most advantageous proposals.† Thus was this territory providentially reserved for Africa's own descendants, far away in exile.

Near the mouth of the Mesurado river are two small islands, containing together less than three acres. The larger of these islands was, at the time the colonists arrived, nearly covered with houses built in the native style, and occupied by a conily of several hundred domestic slaves. They were mostly strangers to this part of the coast, had no participation in the politics of their neighbors, and were frequently the objects of their jealousy, and, till restrained by the protection of the American colony, of their oppression. The smaller of these islands had been obtained by special purchase of one John S. Mill, a half-breed, at that time occupant and proprietor. On this island the colonists, brought from Sierra Leone, were landed on the 7th of January, 1822, and they called it "Perseverance Island." Here they remained until April 25th, when they removed to "Mesurado Heights," and raised the American flag.*

---

* Curry's Historical Discourse.

† White traders have left among the natives so dark and appalling a record that among many of the tribes no deeper insult can be offered to a man of color than calling him a white man. Bishop Payne, of Cape Palmas, informed the writer that the greatest compliment a native can pay to a European is to call him a black man. "You be black man, sir," said a member of that tribe which seemed to express the admiration of the [illegible]. They call a white man [illegible], or [illegible].

The colony henceforward grew, and expanded in territory and influence, taking under its jurisdiction from time to time the large tribes contiguous. The story of the early trials of the colonists, their struggles against the slave-trade, their conflicts with the natives, has been so often told that we must here forego the pleasant task of reviewing those stirring and interesting times.

Before the colonies felt within themselves the vigor sufficient to enable them to maintain an independent existence, circumstances transpired which rendered it necessary that they should avail themselves of the advantages for self-preservation and defense which only a condition of independent sovereignty could afford them. Indeed, by a series of resolutions of the Board of Directors of the American Colonization Society in 1846, the colony was invited to take this step as a means of protection against the oppressive interference of foreigners; and a special fund of $15,000 was raised to buy up the native title to all the coast, from Sherbro to Cape Palmas, in order to secure to the new nationality continuity of coast.†

In the month of July, 1847, the colonies published to the world an eloquent and impressive Declaration of Independence, containing an able representation of the grievances which drove them to emigrate from the United States to Liberia. This document was prepared by the skillful hand of the lamented Hilary Teoge. Remarkable harmony of feeling prevailed among the people. They had come together from different parts of the United States, largely imbued with the local prejudices of the sections in which they had been brought ly of several hundred domestic slaves. They were mostly strangers to this part of the coast, had no participation in the politics of their neighbors, and were frequently the objects of their jealousy, and, till restrained by the protection of the American colony, of their oppression. The smaller of these islands had been obtained by special purchase, of one John S. Mill, a half-breed, at that time occupant and proprietor. On this island the colonists, brought from Sierra Leone, were landed on the 7th of January, 1822, and they called it "Perseverance Island." Here they remained until April 25th, when they removed to "Mesurado Heights," and raised the American flag.*

---

* Days which should be duly commemorated by the Liberians.

† "African Repository," Feb., 1846.

The colony henceforward grew, and expanded in territory and influence, taking under its jurisdiction from time to time the large tribes contiguous. The story of the early trials of the colonists, their struggles against the slave-trade, their conflicts with the natives, has been so often told that we must here forego the pleasant task of reviewing those stirring and interesting times.

Before the colonies felt within themselves the vigor sufficient to enable them to maintain an independent existence, circumstances transpired which rendered it necessary that they should avail themselves of the advantages for self-preservation and defense which only a condition of independent sovereignty could afford them. Indeed, by a series of resolutions of the Board of Directors of the American Colonization Society in 1846, the colony was invited to take this step as a means of protection against the oppressive interference of foreigners; and a special fund of $15,000 was raised to buy up the native title to all the coast, from Sherbro to Cape Palmas, in order to secure to the new nationality continuity of coast.†

In the month of July, 1847, the colonies published to the world an eloquent and impressive Declaration of Independence, containing an able representation of the grievances which drove them to emigrate from the United States to Liberia. This document was prepared by the skillful hand of the lamented Hilary Teage. Remarkable harmony of feeling prevailed among the people. They had come together from different parts of the United States, largely imbued with the local prejudices of the sections in which they had been brought up; but under the inspiration of the idea of independence, the thought of realizing in ever so humble a degree the great object for which they had left the land of their birth, they came together as one man. They knew the responsibilities they were about to assume, but they were vigorous in mind and body, and indomitable in purpose. A few of the first settlers still survived. Elijah Johnson, a tower of strength, was still among them. Self-government was not entirely unknown to the hardy pioneers, for they had had twenty-five years of severe colonial discipline; neither were they unaccustomed to the common forms of constitutional government. They were inured to hardships by the varying occupations of farmers, huntsmen, soldiers, and legislators, in which they had from time to time engaged—occupations which had served to develop those qualities of courage, independence, fortitude, sagacity, common sense, and instinct of government, which made them capable of organizing a system of liberty and equality on these far-off shores.

---

* Days which should be duly commemorated by the Liberians.

† "African Repository," Feb., 1846.

The representatives of the people met in convention, and in thirty days a constitutional code was promulgated, gathered in many parts from the vast experience of the United States. The executive, legislative, and judicial functions were all carefully defined and fenced round with efficient securities, and every regulation necessary for good government; and all this was done without noise, without strife, and with extraordinary promptitude. The authorities thus defined and thus established at once proceeded to exercise the powers conferred by the Constitution.*

The new Republic was soon after welcomed into the family of nations by Great Britain and France. Then, one after another, the other great nations of Europe extended the hand of friendship. The Republic is now in treaty stipulations with England, France, Belgium, Prussia, Italy, the United States, Denmark, Holland, Hayti, Portugal, and Austria.

The government of Liberia is republican. The Republic is divided into four counties: Mesurado, Grand Bassa, Sinou,

---

* In an issue of the "Liberia Herald," published soon after the adjournment of the Convention, (1847,) the editor remarks: "We are truly pleased at the unanimity which prevails among our fellow-citizens with respect to the proceedings of the late Convention."

and Maryland. Monrovia, in Mesurado County, is the capital of the Republic. Each of the counties is represented in the legislature by two Senators and three Representatives; (Mesurado County has four Representatives.) They are elected by the people—the Senators for four years, the Representatives for two years. Besides a property qualification, each Representative must be at least twenty-three years old, and each Senator twenty-five years.

The Republic is governed by a President, who is also elected by the people for a term of two years; but he may be re-elected any number of times. All citizens of the Republic must belong to the Negro race.

At the biennial election held in May, 1869, the question of lengthening the presidential term to four years was submitted to the people. A large number voted in favor of the amendment, but the result not appearing satisfactory to the Legislature, the question was again submitted to the people in May, 1870. On the result of this second election the President and the Legislature differed. The Legislature passed a resolution declaring the amendment not carried; the President vetoed their resolution. The Legislature failing to secure a two-third vote to set aside the veto, the President and his friends held that the constitutional amendment was carried, and he refused to call the usual election in May, 1871. His opponents maintained that his course was unconstitutional, and took it upon themselves to hold an election, at which they voted, with no opposing candidate, for J. J. Roberts for President. This irregularity paved the way for numerous other irregularities, which ended in the deposition of the President.

Of course we must expect that there will be in the outside world a hue and cry against the Negro. We shall hear reiterated from the enemies of the race the charge of his incapability for self-government; as if there were no pure Negro governments in Africa over a thousand years old, conducted with a steadiness and regularity which might put to shame some of the European governments. The people of Liberia have had many and peculiar discouragements to contend against; but they have hitherto manifested a patience and forbearance, an appreciation of liberty, a respect for order, a quickness to comprehend the nature of new institutions and the and Maryland. Monrovia, in Mesurado County, is the capital of the Republic. Each of the counties is represented in the legislature by two Senators and three Representatives; (Mesurado County has four Representatives.) They are elected by the people—the Senators for four years, the Representatives for two years. Besides a property qualification, each Representative must be at least twenty-three years old, and each Senator twenty-five years.

The Republic is governed by a President, who is also elected by the people for a term of two years; but he may be re-elected any number of times. All citizens of the Republic must belong to the Negro race.

At the biennial election held in May, 1869, the question of lengthening the presidential term to four years was submitted to the people. A large number voted in favor of the amendment, but the result not appearing satisfactory to the Legislature, the question was again submitted to the people in May, 1870. On the result of this second election the President and the Legislature differed. The Legislature passed a resolution declaring the amendment not carried; the President vetoed their resolution. The Legislature failing to secure a two-third vote to set aside the veto, the President and his friends held that the constitutional amendment was carried, and he refused to call the usual election in May, 1871. His opponents maintained that his course was unconstitutional, and took it upon themselves to hold an election, at which they voted, with no opposing candidate, for J. J. Roberts for President. This irregularity paved the way for numerous other irregularities which ended in the deposition of the President.

Of course we must expect that there will be in the outside world a hue and cry against the Negro. We shall hear reiterated from the enemies of the race the charge of his incapability for self-government; as if there were no pure Negro governments in Africa over a thousand years old, conducted with a steadiness and regularity which ought put to shame some of the European governments. The people of Liberia have had many and peculiar discouragements to contend against; but they have hitherto manifested a patience and forbearance, an appreciation of liberty, a respect for order, a quickness to comprehend the nature of new institutions and the value of new rights and obligations, at least as signal and as meritorious as can be observed among many of those who are loud in proclaiming the incapacity of the Negro for freedom and self-government.

We hold that in spite of the recent proceedings in Liberia, which must be deplored by every lover of order and good government, that infant nation is on the advance. These sad events are not incompatible with the fulfillment of the noble destiny to which that republic is called. When in 1847 they declared their independence, they embarked on a political system which requires the largest experience in self-government. Democratic institutions are not the best under which to train a people who have hardly acquired the very rudiments of self-government. Hence the tendency lately developed to illegal violence and popular excesses. The will of the populace, acknowledged as supreme, will not tolerate the slowness of constitutional forms—*Populus sic vult, sic jubet, et sit pro ratione voluntas.* It does not even respect the privileges which, for the more efficient exercise of its own supremacy, it has itself created and transferred to a minority. The President and his Cabinet are deposed within three months of the meeting of the Legislature because their acts seem to conflict with the momentary impulses of the majority. But these irregularities are not peculiar to Liberia. We have read of wholesale *fusillades* and *noyades* in large cities much more experienced in the art of government than Liberia. But the proceedings in Liberia will no doubt be raised into prominence by foreign observers, because as an infant Negro State she has not the prestige of a much older community in Europe to vail her blunders, or the pecuniary or political influence to silence her enemies. She is bound to justify herself before the world for such acts. But Liberians, like others, must learn by experience the actual difficulties of administering a popular government. And if at this late day we are told that "the French are waiting for a polity which shall insure them against military reverses and domestic misgovernment," why should the lack of administrative skill in Liberia be a matter of surprise? But

> "There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough hew them as we will."

value of new rights and obligations; at least as signal and as meritorious as can be observed among many of those who are loud in proclaiming the incapacity of the Negro for freedom and self-government.

We hold that in spite of the recent proceedings in Liberia, which must be deplored by every lover of order and good government, that infant nation is on the advance. These sad events are not incompatible with the fulfillment of the noble destiny to which that republic is called. When in 1847 they declared their independence, they embarked on a political system which requires the largest experience in self-government. Democratic institutions are not the best under which to train a people who have hardly acquired the very rudiments of self-government. Hence the tendency lately developed to illegal violence and popular excesses. The will of the populace, acknowledged as supreme, will not tolerate the slowness of constitutional forms—*Populus sic vult, sic jubet, et sit pro ratione voluntas*. It does not even respect the privileges which, for the more efficient exercise of its own supremacy, it has itself created and transferred to a minority. The President and his Cabinet are deposed within three months of the meeting of the Legislature because their acts seem to conflict with the momentary impulses of the majority. But these irregularities are not peculiar to Liberia. We have read of wholesale *fusillades* and *noyades* in large states much more experienced in the art of government than Liberia. But the proceedings in Liberia will no doubt be raised into prominence by foreign observers, because as an infant Negro State she has not the prestige of a much older community in Europe to veil her blunders, or the pecuniary or political influence to silence her enemies. She is bound to justify herself before the world for such acts. But Liberians, like others, must learn by experience the actual difficulties of administering a popular government. And if at this late day we are told that "the French are waiting for a polity which shall insure them against military reverses and domestic misgovernment," why should the lack of administrative skill in Liberia be a matter of surprise? But

"There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them as we will."

Over all the perversities and blindness of a willful ambition there presides a controlling power, which can make them all agencies of his beneficent purposes. The purposes of the Almighty for Africa are not to be thwarted by the folly or wickedness of man. The horrible slave-trade in the days of its unchecked operations seemed to have shut out all hope from the view of the African; but even on the piratical banners of that awful institution the eye of faith might have read in letters of light the words which the great Florentine saw written on the very gates of everlasting woe—

> "Giustizia mosse il mio alto Fattore:
> Fecemi la divina Potestate,
> La somma Sapienza e il primo Amore." *

The artificial and illegitimate obstacles which now hinder the progress of Liberia will soon be removed. We do not say—for we do not expect, and we do not hope—that all differences of opinion will cease, but assuredly the most prolific and the most incurable source of the bitter conflicts in the country will be removed. Relieved from these untoward influences, Liberia has a clear path and smooth future before her. The masses, no longer diverted from their natural bent or confused as to their native instincts, will become intelligent, united, and energetic, and nothing will hinder the rapid progress of a people who possess a territory of ample extent, of great fertility, blessed with many and abundant natural sources of wealth, and a genial climate. How happy is that young nation, to begin with no lingering curse from old institutions or guilty traditions! All things in that infant state are new. No slavery; no compulsion of conscience; no aristocracy or monarchy; no systematized ignorance; free to expand morally, intellectually, individually, and nationally; with a spacious continent as the field of its operations—what a future!

The Veys extend from Gallinas, their northern boundary, to Little Cape Mount, their southern boundary; and they stretch inland about two days' journey. They have invented an

---

* Justice moved my high Maker;
Divine Power made me, Wisdom
Supreme, and primal Love.—*Inferno*, iii.

alphabet for writing their own language, and are enjoying the blessings of a written system, for which they are entirely indebted to their own ingenuity and enterprise. Next to the Mandingoes, they are the most interesting and promising of the aboriginal population of Liberia. Some of their learned men, adepts in the traditional lore of the country, have informed us that the Veys are closely related to the Mandingoes; that they were originally inhabitants of a distant region north-east of their present country; and that, driven away from their home by war, they crossed the mountains and came to the coast, where they carried on successful warfare against the tribes whom they found on the sea-board. Continually pressing toward the south, driving the weaker tribes before them, and forming alliance with the stronger ones, they eventually reached the banks of the St. John's river, in the County of Grand Bassa. Having acquired an ascendant influence over the country through which they had passed, the principal men retraced their steps and settled in the region of Wakora, (Grand Cape Mount,) as a more delightful section of country than any they had seen.

We are quite disposed to credit this statement. First, because the Veys, occupying the narrow extent of country between Gallinas and Little Cape Mount, are an entirely distinct people from the Mende, on the north of them, and the Deys, on the south. The Mende and Dey languages have no particular affinity with the Vey. Second, because the Mandingoes and all the tribes north of Liberia have a tradition of a great and wide-spread war in their country about the close of the seventeenth century, waged by the Foulah Mohammedans for the spread of their religion. Dr. Koelle, who lived five years at Sierra Leone, and made a collection of African stories, gives a very interesting account of those belligerent operations, gathered from the lips of intelligent natives.* It is possible that the Veys, unwilling to adopt the faith of Islam, and not able to resist the conquering hosts, retreated to the south-west and settled in their present locality, where, like the Pelasgians in Etruria, they have retained, amid so many incongruous elements, their tribal integrity.

The plan recently suggested by Bishop Payne, of occupying alphabet for writing their own language, and are enjoying the blessings of a written system, for which they are entirely indebted to their own ingenuity and enterprise. Next to the Mandingoes, they are the most interesting and promising of the aboriginal population of Liberia. Some of their learned men, adepts in the traditional lore of the country, have informed us that the Veys are closely related to the Mandingoes; that they were originally inhabitants of a distant region north-east of their present country; and that, driven away from their home by war, they crossed the mountains and came to the coast, where they carried on successful warfare against the tribes whom they found on the sea-board. Continually pressing toward the south, driving the weaker tribes before them, and forming alliances with the stronger ones, they eventually reached the banks of the St. John's river, in the County of Grand Bassa. Having acquired an ascendant influence over the country through which they had passed, the principal men retraced their steps and settled in the region of *Webbara*, (Grand Cape Mount,) as a more delightful section of country than any they had seen.

---

* Koelle's *Polyglotta Africana.* Introduction, p. 8.

We are quite disposed to credit this statement. First, because the Veys, occupying the narrow extent of country between Gallinas and Little Cape Mount, are an entirely distinct people from the Mende, on the north of them, and the Deys, on the south. The Mende and Dey languages have no particular affinity with the Vey. Second, because the Mandingoes and all the tribes north of Liberia have a tradition of a great and wide-spread war in their country about the close of the seventeenth century, waged by the Foulah Mohammedans for the spread of their religion. Dr. Koelle, who lived five years at Sierra Leone, and made a collection of African stories, gives a very interesting account of those belligerent operations, gathered from the lips of intelligent natives.* It is possible that the Veys, unwilling to adopt the faith of Islam, and not able to resist the conquering hosts, retreated to the south-west and settled in their present locality, where, like the Pelasgians in Etruria, they have retained, amid so many incongruous elements, their tribal integrity.

The plan recently suggested by Bishop Payne, of occupying that country with an extensive and vigorous mission, is most important and interesting; and we venture to affirm, from our own experience in the interior of that region, that no country on the coast presents such an opening for sanitary advantages, and far-reaching evangelical and educational results, as Cape Mount and its adjacent interior. "The Vey tribe," says Bishop Payne, "are the most intelligent of any on the west coast. It was this people who, some fifteen years ago, invented a syllabic alphabet. They hold constant intercourse with the Mandingoes and other Mohammedan tribes in the far interior, and these intelligent neighbors are fast converting them to their false faith."

---

* Koelle's *Polyglotta Africana.* Introduction, p. 6.

The mission-school which the Episcopalians have opened at Totocoreh, east of Boporo, through the watchful energy of Rev. G. W. Gibson, of Monrovia, is nearer to Capt Mount than to Monrovia, so that they have already planted their first outpost toward the vast interior. A mission established on Cape Mount, according to the ripe judgment of Bishop Payne, would enjoy the greatest facilities and advantages for carrying on an educational establishment; while the opportunity of visiting the stations at Boporo and beyond in the charming hill country within one hundred or one hundred and fifty miles, at which a missionary and his family could reside during a part of the year, would be the means of preserving health and vigor.

The next tribe of importance accessible to, and under the influence of, the Liberian Republic, are the Pessehs, located about seventy miles from the coast, and extending about one hundred miles from north to south. They may be called the peasants of West Africa. They supply most of the domestic slaves for the Veys, Bassas, Mandingoes, and Kroos. They are hard-working and industrious. It is said that the work of a Pesseh man is worth twice as much a day as that of a Vey or Bassa. The natives in the low alluvial lands of the coast, who are given to trade, rely for the cultivation of their lands upon the skill and industry of the Pessehs, who have practiced agriculture on the difficult slopes of their hilly country. This people are entirely pagan. No missionary effort, except that of George L. Seymour about fifteen years ago, and which was abandoned because of his death, has ever

been attempted among them. He was supported by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.

A very interesting tribe, next interior to the Pessehs, has recently been brought into treaty relations with Liberia by Mr. W. Spencer Anderson, namely, the *Barline.* The Barline country, about eight days' journey north-east from Monrovia, was visited in 1858 by Mr. James L. Sims, an intelligent young Liberian. Mr. Sims describes Palaka, the capital of Barline, as it appeared at that time, as follows:

> Palaka, which contained about four thousand inhabitants, half of whom were Manni-Mohammedans, and was surrounded by a clay wall nine or ten feet high, had every appearance of being a very old town. The wall in some places was in a very dilapidated condition. The town is situated in a valley, with high mountains on the east and west. In front is a beautiful little river with a vine bridge over it. Between the river and the town were several very large cotton trees, and a large border of black granite rock. In the center of the town was a market-square. The people were the most industrious, and apparently the most happy, I ever met with; it seemed that the whole country was one immense rice farm. The Mohammedan women had several establishments for manufacturing earthenware; while the Barline women prepared rice, palm-oil, and other necessaries, for market.

In describing his experiences at another town, he thus writes:

> The sun is down. From the eastern part of the town comes the sound of voices, floating on the evening zephyr, sweet, plaintive, and mournful. The followers of Mohammed are at prayer. About one third of the inhabitants of this town are Mohammedans, who have settled in Barline for the purpose of trafficking with King Boatswain's people, and some of them are very often seen in the settlements. The country of these people is called Manni. They are scattered all through the Pesseh, Barline, and King Boatswain's country.*

According to the account of Mr. W. Spencer Anderson, the latest explorer, there are no Mohammedans at present in the Barline country.

The next tribe, proceeding south along the coast, is that of the Bassas, occupying a coast line of over sixty miles, and extending about the same distance inland. They are the great producers of palm-oil and canewood, which are sold to foreigners by thousands of tons annually. The Bassa people, numerically

---

* Maryland "Colonization Journal," vol. x, p. 212.

considered, are a very important field for missionary operations. The Northern Baptist Missionary Society established a mission among these people in 1835, conducted by Messrs. Crocker, Mylne, and Clarke, and subsequently by Messrs. Goodman and Sherman. The language was studied out and reduced to writing; as many as three schools, embracing in all nearly a hundred pupils, were organized and taught in a great measure by the missionaries; preaching was maintained statedly at three places, and occasionally at a great many more; and large portions of the New Testament were translated into the Bassa language. But notwithstanding this promising commencement, the mission has been now for several years suspended.

Mr. Jacob W. Vonbrunn, a son of a subordinate king of the Grand Bassa people, but a zealous Christian missionary, has just returned to his native country from a visit to the United States with the valuable results of his experience in that Christian land, and with the assistance afforded by Christian friends, to push forward among his people the work of Christian civilization. The Southern Baptist Convention has lately resumed missionary operations among the Bassas.

The Kroomen occupying the region of country south of Bassa are a large and powerful tribe, and, in many respects, more remarkable than the Bassas. They extend about seventy miles along the coast, and only a few miles inland. They are the sailors of West Africa. They are shrewd, intelligent, and manly, never enslaving or selling each other. The only missionary effort among this tribe was made by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, about thirty years ago, at Settra Kroo. This mission was very successful while it lasted, but it has long since ceased operations; and this large and important tribe is left without God and without hope in the world.

Bordering upon the south-eastern boundaries of the Kroos are the Greboes, another large and influential tribe, extending from Grand Sesters to the Cavalla river, a distance of about seventy miles. It is supposed that this people emigrated about one hundred and fifty years ago from the leeward coast. They are said to equal the Kroomen in physical development, and to resemble them in intellectual character. Indeed, the two tribes have many points in common. The same love of

freedom, the same martial qualities, the same love of maritime adventure, and the same patience of exposure and fatigue, characterize both tribes.

The Greboes have been more favored than the Kroomen as to the enjoyment of Christian influence. In 1834 the first Christian mission was established among them at Cape Palmas by Rev. John Leighton Wilson, a missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. This mission continued in operation for seven years under very encouraging circumstances. A Church was organized, the language was reduced to writing, of which a Grammar and a Dictionary in part were published; the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the Life of Christ, and various other religious books, were translated into it for the use of those who had been taught to read. This mission was in 1842 transferred to Gabun.

But the Episcopal mission established among the same tribe a few years previously still continues in operation. It has passed through many seasons of suffering, sorrow, and bereavement, and is now sadly in need of laborers. But it has had its seasons of prosperity, and may be considered one of the most effective missions on the coast. It has recently established a mission in the interior, and Bohlen, a station about seventy miles from the coast, stands an interesting outpost in the great warfare, and a stimulating monument of the self-denying labors of the lamented Hoffman.

But perhaps the most interesting and promising tribe found in the territory of Liberia are the Mandingoes. They are numerous, intelligent, enterprising, and not a few of them learned. They are found on the whole of the eastern frontier of the Republic, and extend back to the heart of Soudan. Through them Liberia at no distant day may exert a considerable influence on the great and populous interior. They have books and schools and mosques in every large town. They read and write, and many speak the Arabic language. They have diffused every-where among the pagan tribes contiguous to and within the Republic the idea of the presence and power of the Supreme Being.

The Imams subject the boys put under their care for instruction to long years of discipline, during which they are compelled to learn the greater portion of the Koran, and some-freedom, the same martial qualities, the same love of maritime adventure, and the same patience of exposure and fatigue, characterize both tribes.

The Greboes have been more favored than the Kroomen as to the enjoyment of Christian influences. In 1834 the first Christian mission was established among them at Cape Palmas by Rev. John Leighton Wilson, a missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. This mission continued in operation for seven years under very encouraging circumstances. A Church was organized, the language was reduced to writing, of which a Grammar and a Dictionary in part were published; the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the Life of Christ, and various other religious books, were translated into it for the use of those who had been taught to read. This mission was in 1842 transferred to Gabun.

But the Episcopal mission established among the same tribe a few years previously still continues in operation. It has passed through many seasons of suffering, sorrow, and bereavement, and is now sadly in need of laborers. But it has had its seasons of prosperity, and may be considered one of the most effective missions on the coast. It has recently established a mission in the interior, and Bohlen, a station about seventy miles from the coast, stands an interesting outpost in the great warfare, and a stimulating monument of the self-denying labors of the lamented Hoffman.

But perhaps the most interesting and promising tribe found in the territory of Liberia are the Mandingoes. They are numerous, intelligent, enterprising, and not a few of them learned. They are found on the whole of the eastern frontier of the Republic, and extend back to the heart of Soudan. Through them Liberia at no distant day may exert a considerable influence on the great and populous interior. They have books and schools and mosques in every large town. They read and write, and many speak the Arabic language. They have diffused every-where among the pagan tribes contiguous to and within the Republic the idea of the presence and power of the Supreme Being.

The Imams subject the boys put under their care for instruction to long years of discipline, during which they are compelled to learn the greater portion of the Koran, and sometimes the whole, by heart. Thus a large number of youth throughout the interior of Liberia are undergoing a course of training which will fit them to receive more readily the principles of Christian civilization. Cæsar tells us that the ancient Druids carried the children of the Britons through a similar process. Indeed, the description given by that military commander in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of the sixth book of his Commentaries may be applied almost *verbatim* to the Mandingo priests and the communities over which they preside. ·The schools established by them, however inferior, have contributed, in no little degree, to abate the ignorance and soften the manners of the people. The doctrines of Islam, like those of Christianity, are contained in a book accounted sacred. The study of this book, a fundamental duty inseparable from the name and profession of Mussulman, has made the use of letters co-extensive with the propagation of the faith itself. And the study of the Koran, like that of the Bible, necessarily extends beyond the contents of the volume, and, on the same principle, insensibly enlarges the mind of its followers by opening to them other fields of research.* It is worse than useless, therefore, to send uneducated men to evangelize the Mandingoes. The most enlightened missionaries will find it as much labor as they can well manage to put down in argument many of these "benighted Africans." However, we learn that an ambitious young Mohammedan king, named Ibrahima Sisi, occupying a large city called Medina, has been conducting a series of warlike operations against the Kafirs in the surrounding regions to reduce them to the faith, with the watchword, *La ilaha ill' allahu*, etc.—No God but God, etc. Ibrahima is an able and energetic young ruler, having under his command a vast army, terrible to the powers around him. His cavalry consists of one thousand horsemen. His organizing and directing influence in the country is said to be considerable. Having within him the spirit of progress which characterizes the age, he can follow its impulse only in accordance with the light he has in obedience to the highest code of principles known to him. He believes that the reformation and improvement of the tribes around him depend upon their religious passions, and to stimulate those passions by the in-

---

* See Foster's "Mohammedanism Unvailed," vol. ii, sec. 12.

troduction of Islam is his aim. But if he could learn something of the ennobling and loftier principles of Christian civilization, why should we suppose that he would not readily embrace them? It would be well if Liberia could secure his friendship and alliance. His capital is only about four weeks' journey from Monrovia.

We have now hastily glanced at the leading tribes composing the aboriginal population of Liberia. For the most part these people live in towns or villages of from two hundred to five thousand inhabitants, and in communities of eight or ten villages. In these communities, excepting the Mandingoes, they have no written forms of law, but are governed, as a general thing, by certain traditional usages handed down from generation to generation. Nominally monarchy is the only form of government acknowledged among them, but when closely scrutinized, their systems show much more of the popular and patriarchal than of the monarchical element. They cannot be said to be strictly pagan, in the sense, for instance, in which the South Sea islanders were pagans. They all acknowledge one God, and they invoke his assistance, protection, and forgiveness. Their religion is a simple theism or monotheism. If they have not the gorgeous temples of Asia, neither have they its hideous symbolism. They have no "hereditary priesthood wrapt up in a systematized pantheism and polytheism." "When you go to India," says Dr. Duff, "you find the national mind a vast *plenum;* where every point is pre-occupied, where every corner of the soul is filled up, where every faculty is pervaded, where every desire and every emotion of the heart is provided for, and that, too, upon divine authority." * Dr. Macleod, who has recently paid a visit to India, informs us that "in the Bombay Presidency there are thirty thousand idol temples." † The missionary meets no such obstructions to his work in Africa. He finds rather a vast *vacuum* to be filled with the rich treasures of which he is the bearer. He has no physical or metaphysical structures to demolish. He enters upon a vast field entirely unoccupied, or covered only with the rank weeds which, during the neglected centuries, nature has produced.

"Neglectis urenda filix innascitur agris." ‡

---

* Address before Missionary Convention in New York, May, 1851.

† "Good Words," Feb. 1869, page 98.

‡ Horace.

troduction of Islam is likely. But if he could learn something of the ennobling and loftier principles of Christian civilization why should we suppose that he would not readily embrace them? It would be well if Liberia could secure his friendship and alliance. His capital is only about four weeks' journey from Monrovia.

We have now hastily glanced at the leading tribes composing the aboriginal population of Liberia. For the most part these people live in towns or villages of from two hundred to five thousand inhabitants, and in communities of eight or ten villages. In these communities, excepting the Mandingoes, they have no written forms of law, but are governed, as a general thing, by certain traditional usages handed down from generation to generation. Nominally monarchy is the only form of government acknowledged among them, but when closely scrutinized, their systems show much more of the popular and patriarchal than of the monarchical element. They cannot be said to be strictly pagan, in the sense, for instance, in which the South Sea islanders were pagans. They all acknowledge one God, and they invoke his assistance, protection, and forgiveness. Their religion is a simple theism or monotheism. If they have not the gorgeous temples of Asia, neither have they its hideous symbolism. They have no "hereditary priesthood swept up in a systematized pantheism and polytheism." "When you go to India," says Dr. Duff, "you find the national mind a vast plenum; where every point is pre-occupied, where every corner of the soul is filled up, where every faculty is pervaded, where every desire and every emotion of the heart is provided for and that, too, upon divine authority."* Dr. Macleod, who has recently paid a visit to India, informs us that "in the Madras Presidency there are thirty thousand idol temples."† The missionary meets no such obstructions to his work in Africa. He finds rather a vast vacuum to be filled with the rich treasures of which he is the bearer. He has no physical or metaphysical structures to demolish. He enters upon a vast field entirely unoccupied, or covered only with the rank weeds which, during the neglected centuries, nature has produced.

"Neglectis urenda filix innascitur agris."‡

---

* Address before Missionary Convention in New York, Nov. 1854.

† "Good Words," Feb. 1868, page 93.

‡ Horace.

This is the field into which Providence has cast the lot of the few thousand Liberian Christians, offshoots from the American nation. They are there for the physical and moral improvement of their own kith and kin occupying the surrounding wilderness; but above all, for their spiritual well-being.

The indirect influence of Liberia upon the natives has already accomplished much. A revolution has been going on among them ever since January 7, 1822, when the first emigrants landed on Perseverance Island. A new spirit has been gradually insinuating itself among them. The "'Merica man fash" has been silently undermining their superstitions. It is true that domestic slavery still exists in the interior, a circumstance which some of the friends of Liberia abroad seem to view with a degree of concern. To us, however, looking at the matter from a nearer stand-point, it is a subject of no special apprehension. It would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, for the Government of Liberia to interfere directly and effectually to any great extent with that institution. The natives all know that under the laws of Liberia every man is free. Slaves coming into the settlements or their neighborhood, and craving Liberian protection, cannot be taken back to their masters. The evils will gradually pass away as Christian influence advances into the interior. It is well known that throughout Europe serfdom or slavery, where master and slave belonged to the same race, gradually disappeared as civilization advanced, as skill was superadded to physical strength, and as labor became more productive. Every improvement in art and science and industrial contrivance tends to diminish the value of the slave. So it must be in this country.

To help them push forward these triumphs of civilization and Christianity Liberians must look to Christians abroad; and our Negro brethren in America are earnestly entreated to come over with their brain and heart and muscle. We feel that Liberia has a peculiar claim upon the sympathy and assistance of the American people. We know of no country that utters a louder call to the American Church than does Africa through Liberia. God has placed Africa, as it were, at the door of American Christians. There is no other portion of the heathen world that has so large a representative element

This is the field into which Providence has cast the lot of the few thousand Liberian Christians, offshoots from the American nation. They are there for the physical and moral improvement of their own kith and kin occupying the surrounding wilderness; but above all, for their spiritual well-being.

The indirect influence of Liberia upon the natives has already accomplished much. A revolution has been going on among them ever since January 7, 1822, when the first emigrants landed on Perseverance Island. A new spirit has been gradually insinuating itself among them. The "Merica man fash" has been silently undermining their superstitions. It is true that domestic slavery still exists in the interior, a circumstance which some of the friends of Liberia abroad seem to view with a degree of concern. To us, however, looking at the matter from a nearer stand-point, it is a subject of no special apprehension. It would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, for the Government of Liberia to interfere directly and effectually to any great extent with that institution. The natives all know that under the laws of Liberia every man is free. Slaves coming into the settlements or their neighborhood, and craving Liberian protection, cannot be taken back to their masters. The evils will gradually pass away as Christian influence advances into the interior. It is well known that throughout Europe serfdom or slavery, where master and slave belonged to the same race, gradually disappeared as civilization advanced, as skill was superadded to physical strength, and as labor became more productive. Every improvement in art and science and industrial contrivance tends to diminish the value of the slave. So it must be in this country.

To help them push forward these triumphs of civilization and Christianity Liberians must look to Christians abroad; and our Negro brethren in America are earnestly entreated to come over with their brain and heart and muscle. We feel that Liberia has a peculiar claim upon the sympathy and assistance of the American people. We know of no country that utters a louder call to the American Church than does Africa through Liberia. God has placed Africa, as it were, at the door of American Christians. There is no other portion of the heathen world that has so large a representative element residing in a foreign land as Africa has residing in America. There is no other portion of the globe that has sent forth its children in such numbers to perform unrequited labor in a foreign country as has this aged mother of civilization. Her children, torn by millions from her bleeding bosom, are now in the United States. Having passed through the dire ordeal of slavery, they are now getting imbued with American culture. This is a tie binding the United States to Africa to which no other country can show a parallel. In view of the long and weary centuries in which her children have suffered and toiled in that land; in view of the mental training and discipline they are now undergoing, fitting them to shed blessings upon her distracted country; in view of her forlorn and desolate condition, Africa, with all the passionate love of a mother, stretches out her hands in supplication to the United States. Here are

> "Tears more eloquent than learned tongue,
> Or lyre of purest note."

The wilderness and the desert are waiting for the reviving power of Western civilization, purchased by the groans and blood of generations of men. Millions of aspiring souls, groping in darkness after some higher life, are waiting to receive the quickening influence of the arts and sciences—waiting for the discipline of those circumstances which have wrought out such great changes in Europe and America.

We expect that the recovery of Africa from her protracted desolation will be rapid and sudden. "Ethiopia shall *soon*, or *suddenly*, stretch out her hands unto God." We expect that thousands of her sons, prepared and fitted for the work, will hasten to these slaves from the lands of their thralldom; that the hundreds of thousands of benighted men at home will be wakened to habits of regular industry and thrift. The diverse and conflicting tribes will be rapidly reduced to unity under the influence of Christian principles—a tide of common life will sweep through the whole half a million immediately around Liberia, and through them regions beyond will be speedily absorbed. We expect soon to witness the beautiful scene of skillful tillage, abounding harvests, contented cottages, thrifty villages, opulent cities, the products of the spindle and

shuttle and forge and mill and wheel and boiler. Already we seem to hear

> "The sound of that advancing multitude
> Which soon shall fill these deserts. From the ground
> Comes up the laugh of children, the soft voice
> Of maidens, and the sweet and solemn hymn
> Of Sabbath-worshipers. The low of herds
> Blends with the rustling of the heavy grain
> Over the dark brown furrows;"
> . . . While "the great heavens
> Seem to look down upon the scene in love." *

We believe that among the descendants of Africa in the Western Hemisphere there are talent enough, wealth enough, and numbers enough to accomplish all this before the centennial anniversary of the American Colonization Society, if they would but earnestly give themselves to the work. O that they would feel it their duty and could be assisted to come! Men and brethren, help!

ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Development and Human Descent. 2. Palfrey on Religious Intolerance in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. 3. The Mutual Relation of Baptism and the Communion. 4. The Emperor Marcus Aurelius. 5. The Interior Facts of Baptism. 6. Christus Conditor.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, AND THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC, April, 1872. (Andover.)—1. Lecky on Morals. 2. Darwinism. 3. What is Truth? 4. The Christian Law of Service. 5. The Three Fundamental Methods of Preaching—Preaching Extempore.

MERCERSBURG REVIEW, April, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Relation of the Formal and Material Principles of Protestantism to the Principles of Christianity. 2. The Idea of Church Authority. 3. The Office of the Holy Ministry Viewed from the Stand-point of Christ's Atonement. 4. Philosophy and Christianity. 5. Meeting of the Extremes. 6. Christ's Descent into Hell. 7. The Elves. 8. American Theology. 9. Do Ghosts Appear?

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1872. (Boston.)—1. The German Mission of Count Benedetti. 2. Steinthal on the Origin of Language. 3. On the International Workingmen's Association; its Origin, Doctrines, and Ethics. 4. The Law of Maritime Warfare, as it Affects the Belligerents.

PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York.)—1. Henry Cooke, D.D., and Arianism in the Irish Church. 2. The Eldership Question. 3. The Benevolent Work of the Church and the Report of the Committee of Twenty-one. 4. Bishop Hefele on Pope Honorius. 5. Dr. Jacob's shuttle and forge and mill and wheel and boiler. Already we seem to hear

---

* Bryant.

> "The sound of that advancing multitude
> Which soon shall fill these deserts. From the ground
> Comes up the laugh of children, the soft voice
> Of maidens, and the sweet and solemn hymn
> Of Sabbath-worshippers. The low of herds
> Blends with the rustling of the heavy grain
> Over the dark brown furrows."
> . . . While "the great heavens
> Seem to look down upon the scene in love."*

We believe that among the descendants of Africa in the Western Hemisphere there are talent enough, wealth enough, and numbers enough to accomplish all this before the centennial anniversary of the American Colonization Society, if they would but earnestly give themselves to the work. O that they would feel it their duty and could be excited to enter! Men and brethren, help!

ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Development and Human Descent. 2. Failure of Religious Instruction in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. 3. The Mutual Relation of Baptism and the Communion. 4. The Emperor Marcus Aurelius. 5. The Interior Facts of Baptism. 6. Christian Culture.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, AND THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC, April, 1872. (Andover.)—1. Locke on Morals. 2. Darwinism. 3. What is Truth? 4. The Christian Law of Service. 5. The Three Fundamental Methods of Preaching—Practical Extempore.

MERCERSBURG REVIEW, April, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Relation of the Formal and Material Principles of Protestantism to the Principle of Christianity. 2. The Idea of Church Authority. 3. The Office of the Holy Scripture Viewed from the Standpoint of Christ's Atonement. 4. Philosophy and Christianity. 5. Meaning of the Eucharist. 6. Curtis's Ignatius and Bell. 7. The Fires. 8. American Theology. 9. Is Christ Appearing?

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1872. (Boston.)—1. The German Mission of Count Benedetti. 2. Schleicher on the Origin of Language. 3. On the so-called Wordsworth's Association; its Origin, Doctrines, and Ethics. 4. The Law of Maritime Warfare, as it Affects the Belligerents.

PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York.)—1. Henry Cooke, D.D., and Arianism in the Irish Church. 2. The Sabbath Question. 3. The Benevolent Work of the Church and the Report of the Committee of Twenty-one. 4. Bishop Hefele on Pope Honorius. 5. Mr. Jaco-

---

* Bryant.

Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament. 6. The Literature, History, and Civilization of the Japanese. 7. The Mode of Raising Funds for Church Work. 8. Systematic Beneficence in the Presbyterian Church. 9. Notes on Current Topics. 10. Masson's Life of John Milton.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, April, 1872. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Protestant Infallibility. 2. Practical Exposition of Scripture. 3. The Sufferings of Christ. 4. Christianity the Re-adjuster. 5. The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. 6. The Christian Ministry of Labor. 7. Dr. Hodge on "the Lutheran Doctrine" of the Person of Christ.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1872. (London.)—1. Life and Times of Dr. Henry Cooke. 2. The Natural and the Supernatural. 3. Dr. Wordsworth on the Church of England. 4. Ulrich Zwingli. 5. The Lost Epistles of St. Paul. 6. The Perspective in Prophecy. 7. Our English Bible.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Poetry of Matthew Arnold. 2. The Modern Newspaper. 3. The American Civil War. 4. Pope and his Editors. 5. The Licensing System. 6. Sir Henry Holland's Recollections. 7. Kidnapping in the South Seas. 8. The Conference of Nonconformists.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1872. (London.)—1. Unitarianism. 2. Walter Scott: a Centenary Tribute. 3. The Contemporary Literature of France. 4. British Journalism. 5. Shelley and his Poetry. 6. Primary Education in Ireland. 7. The Resurrection of Christ. 8. Kalisch on Leviticus.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Trial by Judge and Trial by Jury. 2. The Political Reconstruction of Germany. 3. The University College of Wales. 4. India: The Musalman Panic. 5. Christian Theology and Modern Skepticism. 6. Napoleon the First: The Man. 7. The Migration of Labor. 8. The Question of Race in France. 9. Spiritualism and its Evidences. 10. The Distribution of Representation.

The Fifth Article, based upon the Duke of Somerset's shallow deistical book noticed in our Book-Table, is a square and frank attack upon the truth of Christianity. Its method is, *first*, to show up the entire system of orthodox Christianity; especially its doctrines of damnation of the sinner for foreknown sin, and his salvation by the sacrifice of an innocent victim, as fundamentally and flagrantly contradictory to reason and ethic; and, *second*, to show that while the authenticity of the New Testament records is unsustainable, nevertheless the "Evidences of Christianity" cannot claim any proper attention until the dogmas are shown to be allowable by reason.

The following extract may serve to justify the belief that the real issue at stake at the present hour is between orthodox Christianity and blank Atheism. It is a collision in which all intermediates are ground to powder. All medium beliefs, such as unitarianism, rationalism, pious theism, are but half-way

Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament. 6. The European Dialects, and Civilization of the Aryans. 7. The Mode of Raising Funds for Church Work. 8. Systematic Beneficence in the Presbyterian Church. 9. Notes on Current Topics. 10. Masson's Life of John Milton.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, April, 1872. (Gettysburg.)—1. Protestant Infallibility. 2. Practical Exposition of Scripture. 3. The Sufferings of Christ. 4. Christianity the Aggressor. 5. The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex. 6. The Christian Dignity of Labor. 7. Dr. Hodge on "the Lutheran Doctrine" of the Person of Christ.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1872. (London.)—1. Life and Times of Dr. Henry Cooke. 2. The Natural and the Supernatural. 3. Dr. Wordsworth on the Church of England. 4. Greek Passage. 5. The Last Epistles of St. Paul. 6. The Perspective in Prophecy. 7. Our English Bible.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Poetry of Matthew Arnold. 2. The Modern Newspaper. 3. The American Civil War. 4. Peru and its Colonies. 5. The Licensing System. 6. Sir Henry Holland's Recollections. 7. Kidnapping in the South Seas. 8. The Conference of Nonconformists.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1872. (London.)—1. Unitarianism. 2. Walter Scott: a Centenary Tribute. 3. The Contemporary Literature of France. 4. British Journalism. 5. Shelley and his Poetry. 6. Primary Education in Ireland. 7. The Resurrection of Christ. 8. Kalisch on Leviticus.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Trial by Judge and Trial by Jury. 2. The Political Reconstruction of Germany. 3. The University College of Wales. 4. Islam: The Mussulman Faith. 5. Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism. 6. Napoleon the Fourth: The Man. 7. The Migration of Labor. 8. The Question of Race in France. 9. Spiritualism and its Evidences. 10. The Resolution of Representation.

The Fifth Article, based upon the Duke of Somerset's shallow deistical book noticed in our Book-Table, is a square and frank attack upon the truth of Christianity. Its method is, *first*, to show up the entire system of orthodox Christianity; especially its doctrines of damnation of the sinner for foreknown sin, and his salvation by the sacrifice of an innocent victim, as fundamentally and flagrantly contradictory to reason and ethic; and, *second*, to show that while the authenticity of the New Testament records is unassailable, nevertheless the "Evidences of Christianity" cannot claim any proper attention until the dogmas are shown to be allowable by reason.

The following extract may serve to justify the belief that the real issue at stake at the present hour is between orthodox Christianity and blank Atheism. It is a collision in which all intermediates are ground to powder. All medium beliefs, such as unitarianism, rationalism, pious theism, are but half-way houses on the road to atheism, where individuals and classes may now make their abode, but which will be rapidly passed by the entire age as it renounces the central Christian system.

"In all probability the Duke of Somerset, in common with others who abandon Christianity for Theism, had not considered that in asserting the existence of a God at all he was committing the same fault as that with which he charged the supporters of revelation. The same class of fault, no doubt; *mais il y a des dégrés.* It is surely somewhat more simple, and it is certainly less audacious, to assert the unprovable existence of a Personal Author of the Material Universe, than first to assert that much, and afterward to go on to make many further and more complex, and, to say the least of them, equally unprovable assertions as to how, when, where, and for what purposes, he has manifested himself to mankind. Besides, there are Theisms and Theisms. There is the Theism of men who, having extricated themselves from the slough of systematic theology, halt and say, 'We have done much and are weary; moreover, we have now come to the end of our certainties, and shall not proceed any further till we are assured of the feasibility and accuracy of the onward route.' With such men Theism is a caravanserai of thought. It may or may not also prove to be thought's goal, but at present it is only occupied as a resting-place. In any event it will be perfectly logical for them hereafter to look back on their intermediate position and to say, 'We started as Theists because we were Christians; the time came when we had made up our minds against Christianity while we had not made them up in favor of Atheism; we were then Theists still, and properly called ourselves so. We were not bound to abandon the name till we were convinced of the propriety of its abandonment.' This may be called Negative Theism, and whether it prove transitional or not in the experience of an individual, it is still logical. In the present state of our scientific knowledge it may be safely said that to assert the existence of God as a positive fact would be illogical in kind as Christianity is, though not to the same degree. But, on the other hand, it is plain that if even a moderate exercise of circumspection, caution, and clear thought be intellectually meritorious, then pure Theism, even if positive, must be a far more venial mental weakness than orthodox Christianity.

houses on the road to atheism, where individuals and classes may now make their abode, but which will be rapidly passed by the entire age as it renounces the central Christian system.

"In all probability the Duke of Somerset, in common with others who abandon Christianity for Theism, had not considered that in asserting the existence of a God at all he was committing the same fault as that with which he charged the supporters of revelation. The same class of fault, no doubt; *mais il y a des degrés*. It is merely somewhat more simple, and it is certainly less audacious, to assert the unprovable existence of a Personal Author of the Material Universe, than first to assert that much, and afterward to go on to make many further and more complex, and, to say the least of them, equally unprovable assertions as to how, when, where, and for what purposes, he has manifested himself to mankind. Besides, there are Theisms and Theisms. There is the Theism of men who, having extricated themselves from the slough of systematic theology, halt and say, 'We have done much and are weary; moreover, we have now come to the end of our certainties, and shall not proceed any further till we are assured of the feasibility and accuracy of the onward route.' With such men Theism is a caravanserai of thought. It may or may not also prove to be thought's goal, but at present it is only occupied as a resting-place. In any event it will be perfectly logical for them hereafter to look back on their intermediate position and to say, 'We started as Theists because we were Christians; the time came when we had made up our minds against Christianity while we had not made them up in favor of Atheism; we were then Theists still, and properly called ourselves so. We were not bound to abandon the name till we were convinced of the propriety of its abandonment.' This may be called Negative Theism, and whether it prove transitional or not in the experience of an individual, it is still logical. In the present state of our scientific knowledge it may be safely said that to assert the existence of God as a positive fact would be illogical in kind as Christianity is, though not to the same degree. But on the other hand, it is plain that if even a moderate exercise of circumspection, caution, and clear thought be intellectually meritorious, then pure Theism, even if positive, must be a far more venial mental weakness than orthodox Christianity.

"What has just now been said must be read with a secondary meaning as an apology for Theism made to those more advanced thinkers who are apt to look back upon the intermediate stages of skepticism with little less impatience than they do upon Christians. Its primary intention as a rejoinder to certain controversialists, whose best argument is only an uncandid claim of cousinship in superstition, is far less important, for it makes nothing whatever in favor of the reception of elaborate dogmata to show that the little which is received by the more cautious is proportionately as unwarranted as the much that is swallowed by the most reckless; but it is a matter of keen import that a sympathy and a solidarity should be established between those who have started on the right road and those who feel that they have arrived at its goal. Men of extreme (and by extreme are here meant finished) convictions are somewhat too apt to refuse fellowship or countenance to what is inchoate or imperfect. They are prone to mistake incompleteness for compromise. They confound temporary exhaustion with some cause or other fundamentally unsatisfactory. This is to be uncharitable, hasty, brusque, exclusive; to be all or any of which is to be unwise. Some minds move more slowly over difficulties, some hearts pant longer before dangers, than do others. The retrospect of their own struggles might surely teach the most victorious that the campaign of self-emancipation is seldom won in a single battle, and that there is a tendency, if not a necessity, oftentimes to bivouac upon the field. Nine out of ten out of the multiplicity of half-way creeds are due not to any positive mental divergencies, but to variations in courage or in mental speed. A failure in the bravest and strongest to recognize this has done much to impede the religious progress of English society. They have held themselves aloof in an isolation contemptuous, uncaring, surly. They have refused to go out into the highways and hedges and compel men to come in. The invitations of the orthodox of every shade toward retrogression have been far more sedulously and generously extended, and the consequence is that thousands who might once have been made guests at the feasts of reason and freedom now permanently sup nonsense with the fettered and the mean."

Bishop Colenso has opened his battery upon the "Speaker's

Commentary" on the Pentateuch in a pamphlet of one hundred and forty-seven pages, attacking the introductions and the notes on Genesis. The following eulogy on his "The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Considered" in this bitter infidel Quarterly illustrates how little a successional episcopacy may be a security for soundness of faith.

"Dr. Colenso, after prosecuting his researches into the Pentateuch with an industry and perseverance worthy of all praise, has almost completed them in a sixth volume, which appears to us the most important of the series. It addresses itself to scholars rather than general readers, though the latter may easily follow its arguments and perhaps understand their force. The bishop's intellect has lost none of its vigor or lucidity, if we may judge from the bulky work before us. Rather has it acquired strength and breadth. His Hebrew learning is of a superior order, placing him on a height immeasurably above that of his opponents or detractors. He deals with the ancient documents after the fashion of a ripe German scholar, so that none can fairly deny his critical ability. The volume takes its place at once beside the most important works on the Pentateuch, and will command the attentive perusal of all who are interested in the criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures. Fortunately for the bishop's scholarly reputation, he has followed up his first part by a succession of others, each showing a development of intellectual power and critical sagacity which casts his enemies into the shade of ignorance. The chief point here investigated is the age of the Levitical legislation. In doing this the learned author travels over a field embracing from Exodus to Joshua inclusive, carefully separating the contents of the books, and assigning them to certain dates or authors. In all cases objections are answered and traditionary views set aside. Speaking generally, we may say the most of Leviticus, with large portions of Numbers and Exodus, are attributed to the Captivity or after. The object is to bring down the priestly legislation in particular to a late age. The bishop follows in the wake of Graf and Kuenen, who endeavor to prove the same thing. Those who will have the patience to go through the volume with a care proportionate to its importance will be amply rewarded, for there is a richness of materials which enlarges the vision, suggests inquiry, and

Commentary" on the Pentateuch is a pamphlet of one hundred and forty-seven pages, attacking the introduction and the notes on Genesis. The following eulogy on his "The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Considered" in this latter named Quarterly illustrates how little a successional episcopacy may be a security for soundness of faith.

"Dr. Colenso, after prosecuting his researches into the Pentateuch with an industry and perseverance worthy of all praise, has almost completed them in a sixth volume, which appears to us the most important of the series. It addresses itself to scholars rather than general readers, though the latter may easily follow its arguments and perhaps understand their force. The bishop's intellect has lost none of its vigor, or lucidity, if we may judge from the bulky work before us. Rather has it acquired strength and breadth. His Hebrew learning is of a superior order, placing him on a height immeasurably above that of his opponents or detractors. He deals with the ancient documents after the fashion of a ripe German scholar, so that none can fairly deny his critical ability. The volume takes its place at once beside the most important works on the Pentateuch, and will command the attentive perusal of all who are interested in the criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures. Fortunately for the bishop's scholarly reputation, he has followed up his first part by a succession of others, each showing a development of intellectual power and critical sagacity which casts his enemies into the shade of ignorance. The chief point here investigated is the age of the Levitical legislation. In doing this the learned author travels over a field extending from Exodus to Joshua inclusive, carefully separating the contents of the books, and assigning them to certain classes of authors. In all cases objections are answered and traditionary views set aside. Speaking generally, we may say the most of Leviticus, with large portions of Numbers and Exodus, are attributed to the Captivity or after. The object is to bring down the priestly legislation in particular to a late age. The bishop follows in the wake of Graf and Kuenen, who endeavor to prove the same thing. Those who will have the patience to go through the volume with a care proportionate to its importance will be amply rewarded, for there is a rich material, which enlarges the vision, suggests inquiry, and stimulates thought. We have not space even for a summary of the contents, but must refer to the preface for it. How far it is possible to agree with the bishop could not be explained without the discussion of numerous details unsuited to a general notice. While looking upon the goodly volume as an addition and an ornament to the best literature of the Pentateuch, commending its general spirit, recognizing the masterly exegesis, the thorough acquaintance of the topics examined, and the fair tone in which every result is enunciated, we hesitate to accept the late date of all, or even the greater part, of the institutions here assigned to the Babylonian captivity and after."

EDINBURGH REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Burn's Rome and the Campagna. 2. The Royal Institution. 3. Guizot's Memoir of the late Duke de Broglie. 4. Mr. Miall on Disestablishment. 5. Letters and Discoveries of Sir Charles Bell. 6. Oceanic Circulation. 7. The Works of John Hookham Frere. 8. The Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham. 9. The Claims of the United States.

The following extract from Article IX shows how our English cousins put their own Case, and suggests additional cause of doubt whether Mr. Sumner is the *beau ideal* of a moderate statesman:

"Among the thoughts suggested to us by the perusal of the Case for the United States (published by Bentley, and professing to be a *fac-simile* of the official copy) the most prominent was this: that if the conditions under which neutrality is to be maintained or suffered be those expounded in this singular volume it is not the interest of a nation to observe neutrality. According to what we read in this 'Case' we had the fate of the American Civil War in our hands; for if a few inconsiderable privateers had power, by their marauding excursions, to protract the war for two years, what might not have been done if we had put forth our maritime strength? Had we even declined to recognize the very questionable blockade of the Southern ports, the North, by the confession of this pleading, must have been greatly enfeebled; and if we had joined with France, and intervened to terminate the struggle in November, 1862, there would have been an end, at all events, of 'Alabama' claims. Nor were we without solid interests at stake which urged us in that direction. To say nothing of the internecine and hideous aspect of the war stimulates thought. We have not space even for a summary of the contents, but must refer to the preface for it. How far it is possible to agree with the bishop could not be explained without the discussion of numerous details unsuited to a general notice. While looking upon the goodly volume as an addition and an ornament to the best literature of the Pentateuch, commending its general spirit, recognizing the masterly exegesis, the thorough acquaintance of the topics examined, and the fair tone in which every result is enunciated, we hesitate to accept the late date of all, or even the greater part, of the institutions here assigned to the Babylonian captivity and after."

EDINBURGH REVIEW, April, 1873. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Burn's Rome and the Campagna. 2. The Royal Institution. 3. Guizot's Memoir of the late Duke de Broglie. 4. Mr. Mill on [illegible]ment. 5. Letters and Discoveries of Sir Charles Bell. 6. Oceanic Circulation. 7. The Works of John Hookham Frere. 8. The Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham. 9. The Claims of the United States.

The following extract from Article IX shows how our English cousins put their own Case, and suggests additional cause of doubt whether Mr. Sumner is the *beau ideal* of a moderate statesman:

"Among the thoughts suggested to us by the perusal of the Case for the United States (published by Bentley, and professing to be a *fac-simile* of the official copy) the most prominent was this: that if the conditions under which neutrality is to be maintained or suffered be those expounded in this singular volume it is not the interest of a nation to observe neutrality. According to what we read in this 'Case' we had the fate of the American Civil War in our hands; for if a few inconsiderable privateers had power, by their unremitting exertions, to protract the war for two years, what might not have been done if we had put forth our maritime strength! Had we even declined to recognize the very questionable blockade of the Southern ports, the North, by the confession of this pleading, must have been greatly enfeebled; and if we had joined with France, and intervened to terminate the struggle in November, 1862, there would have been an end, at all events, of 'Alabama' claims. Nor were we without solid interests at stake which urged us in that direction. To say nothing of the internecine and hideous aspect of the war itself, fearful beyond any record of civil slaughter, our great manufacturing staple was withdrawn from us, our manufacturing population were exposed to the cruelest hardships, and our manufacturers to ruin, as the price of our fidelity to our neutral obligations. We were faithful, however, although the American Case makes it doubtful if we had any motive or interest to be so. Our operatives bore their privations with a magnanimity without example, we believe, in neutral nations; and we resisted the solicitations of the Emperor of the French to alter our policy, even although it brought daily injury to ourselves. And now that all is done, and the North, not without the aid of German recruits and British munitions of war, has subjugated the South, how are we rewarded? America claims from us the whole expense of the war incurred after the battle of Gettysburgh; the whole expense of Grant's last campaign and Lee's masterly defense; of Sherman's march through Georgia; of the weary, almost hopeless, waiting of the Northern armies before Richmond, up to the long-deferred but final surrender. We are to pay for all this. Should we not have been better off as belligerents? for according to these demands the belligerent is to come off free, and the neutral to pay all.

"Nor may we forget what the battle of Gettysburgh was. It was the cast of a die by the South for final victory. Up to that time so utterly had the North failed, with all the enormous advantages which their blockade and their command of the sea gave them, to subdue the South, that they had retired, stunned and bewildered, after Stonewall Jackson's last battle; and Lee felt himself strong enough to become the aggressor, and carry the war into the States of the North. He almost succeeded. The battle of Gettysburgh hung long in suspense; and had the scale turned the other way the ultimate event might not, perhaps, have been altered, but would certainly have been much longer deferred. Lee retreated to the territory of the South almost unmolested, presenting to the North the same solid front as that against which three of their armies had before dashed themselves in vain. Yet the truth of history tells us, as we find it written in the American Case, that the war from this date was only kept alive by the roving freebooters, the 'Ala-itself fearful beyond any record of civil slaughter, our great manufacturing staple was withdrawn from us, our manufacturing population were exposed to the cruelest hardships, and our manufacturers to ruin, as the price of our fidelity to our neutral obligations. We were faithful, however, although the American Case makes it doubtful if we had any motive or interest to be so. Our operatives bore their privations with a magnanimity without example, we believe, in neutral nations; and we resisted the solicitations of the Emperor of the French to alter our policy, even although it brought daily injury to ourselves. And now that all is done, and the North, not without the aid of German recruits and British munitions of war, has subjugated the South, how are we rewarded! America claims from us the whole expense of the war incurred after the battle of Gettysburgh; the whole expense of Grant's last campaign and Lee's masterly defence; of Sherman's march through Georgia; of the weary, almost hopeless, waiting of the Northern armies before Richmond, up to the long deferred but final surrender. We are to pay for all this. Should we not have been better off as belligerents? for according to these demands the belligerent is to come off free, and the neutral to pay all.

"Nor may we forget what the battle of Gettysburgh was. It was the cast of a die by the South for final victory. Up to that time so utterly had the North failed, with all the enormous advantages which their blockade and their command of the sea gave them, to subdue the South, that they had retired, stunned and bewildered, after Stonewall Jackson's last battle; and Lee felt himself strong enough to become the aggressor, and carry the war into the States of the North. He almost succeeded. The battle of Gettysburgh hung long in suspense; and had the scale turned the other way the ultimate event might not, perhaps, have been altered, but would certainly have been much longer deferred. Lee retreated to the territory of the South almost unconquered, presenting to the North the same solid front as that against which three of their armies had before dashed themselves in vain. Yet the truth of history tells us, as we find it written in the American Case, that the war from this date was only kept alive by the roving freebooters, the 'Alabama,' the 'Florida,' and the 'Shenandoah,' and that if these had been captured or sunk the South would instantly have collapsed.

"Had we become belligerents it would certainly, at this rate, have been better for our purse. Would it have been worse for the good feeling which ought to prevail between the two countries? Not if we are to believe the American Case. Our neutrality, it seems, has only left behind feelings as bitter and exasperation as intense as war itself could have produced. Our very neutrality, we are told, was as hostile and as offensive as war could have been; our sayings and our doings, official and non-official, are now paraded in order to give expression to what, according to the Case, is the deliberate sense of the nation. Even the Washington Treaty has done nothing to moderate the poignancy of American resentment, which is faithfully depicted, as we are asked to believe, in this remarkable State paper.

"We may say, once for all, that we regret no part of our past impartiality; but this Case no more represents either the facts of history, or genuine American opinion, than the monstrous heads and distorted limbs we see in a pantomime represent the human figure. The draughtsmen of the Case strive to produce their effects, as the scenic artist does, by grotesque exaggeration; and the result has been, for the present at least, to obstruct if not to destroy a course of amicable and sensible adjustment in which, if some things were surrendered which strict adherence to theory might have maintained, the English nation were ready to recognize, with good humor and friendliness, a mutual desire for a practical closing of accounts. But this demand has gone beyond all limits of patience, and is placed on grounds which leave no room for its exercise."—Pp. 280, 281.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The State of English Architecture. 2. Thomas Carlyle. 3. Trade with China. 4. Masson's Life of Milton. 5. Modern Skepticism—The Duke of Somerset. 6. The British Parliament; its History and Eloquence. 7. Diaries of a Diplomatist. 8. Education, Secularism, and Nonconformity. 9. Concession to the United States.

The Fifth Article is a very just castigation of the Duke of Somerset's deistical pamphlet noticed in our Book Table. The following sarcasms on the "modern thought" cant admirably hit the point:

"The time was when even skeptics approached the mysteries of 'Christian Theology' with religious reverence, and deemed the evidences of Scripture worthy of refutation by serious argument, and by learning not picked up at random; when the triumph they sought to win in however bad a cause was at least a triumph of argument. But all this is now changed by a school which arrogates to itself the claim of uttering the conclusive sentence of 'modern *thought*,' the *ipse dixit* of an invisible and irresponsible judge, not simply rejecting all old religious authority, but assuming belief to be an exploded superstition. The very title of the volume before us expresses the spirit of this school by a double antithesis. Christian belief has always taken the form of 'theology,' but the essence of science is 'skepticism:' the former is old, the latter is 'modern,' an epithet equivalent, if not to perfection, at least to an ever-growing improvement, the more sure and rapid in the measure of its rejecting whatever is old. But a closer scrutiny of this claim detects the true meaning of the term '*modern*'—a mere *fashion* of the day, adopted by a school of half-educated, one-sided men, who boast of it as loudly and demand as unreasoning a submission as do equally qualified leaders of fashion in dress.

"'We, in this *later age*'—a phrase on which 'they ring round the same unvaried chimes'—have come to the conclusion that 'the progress of civilization has not been favorable to faith.' There is scarcely one page of the volume in which we are not met by this offensive assumption. In the compass of a brief Introduction the writer reiterates on every single page such statements as the following: 'The opinions of *educated society* upon the most important questions that can occupy the human mind appear *at the present time* to be more unsettled than at any previous period of European history:' 'a change in religious thought has gradually forced its way through the *cultivated classes* of the community:' 'the whole system of *modern education* tends toward the same result:' 'skepticism has been naturalized in *modern society*,' 'pervades the whole *atmosphere of thought*, and leads the *most learned societies*,' and '*the mass of society* is anxiously seeking a belief which shall not be at issue with *the moral sense of educated men*:' 'it is *now obvious* that the theology of former

"The time was when even skeptics approached the mysteries of 'Christian Theology' with religious reverence, and deemed the evidences of Scripture worthy of refutement by serious argument, and by learning not picked up at random; when the triumph they sought to win in however bad a cause was at least a triumph of argument. But all this is now changed by a school which arrogates to itself the claim of uttering the conclusive sentence of '*modern thought*,' the *verdict* of an invisible and irresponsible judge, not simply rejecting all old religious authority, but assuming belief to be an exploded superstition. The very title of the volume before us expresses the spirit of this school by a double antithesis: Christian belief has always taken the form of 'theology,' but the essence of science is 'skepticism:' the former is old, the latter is 'modern,' an epithet equivalent, if not to perfection, at least to an ever-growing improvement, the more sure and rapid in the measure of its rejecting whatever is old. But a closer scrutiny of this claim detects the true meaning of the term '*modern*'—a mere *fashion* of the day, adopted by a school of half-educated, one-sided men, who boast of it as loudly and demand as unreasoning a submission as do equally qualified leaders of fashion in dress.

"'WE, in this *later age*'—a phrase on which 'they ring round the same wearied chimes'—have come to the conclusion that 'the progress of civilization has not been favorable to faith.' There is scarcely one page of the volume in which we are not met by this offensive assumption. In the compass of a brief Introduction the author reiterates on every single page such statements as the following: 'The opinions of *educated society* upon the most important questions that can occupy the human mind appear *at the present time to be more unsettled* than at any previous period of European history;' 'a change in religious thought has gradually forced its way through the *cultivated classes* of the community;' 'the whole system of modern *education* tends toward the same result;' 'skepticism has been naturalized in *modern society*,' 'pervades the whole *atmosphere of thought*, and taints *the most learned societies*,' and '*the mass of society is anxiously seeking* a belief which shall not be at issue with the *moral sense of educated men*;' '*it is now obvious* that the theology of former days *cannot* be permanently maintained' amid 'the process of religious change, which is gradually *permeating the Protestant world.*' These phrases occur in just a twentieth part of the whole work, and they are repeated nearly twenty times.

"The complacency with which the writer regards 'this altered condition of belief' of '*the* educated Protestant' (for the definite article is made to do yeoman's service in the cause of mere assertion) is matched by the cool scorn with which old beliefs are put aside as dead, and hardly worth burying. For this purpose the past tense is made as serviceable as the definite article. 'So long as Christians *believed* in the personifica-fication of evil'—are the opening words of the first chapter, the whole of which is pitched to the same key-note. 'From the commencement of the Christian era until comparatively *modern* times the existence of evil spirits *was* appealed to in vindication of the Gospel history.' The 'scientific Barrow and the learned Bishop Bull' are cited to prove 'to how late a period the belief in the intervention of the devil *was* regarded as an important bulwark of the Christian faith.' Yet now—says the higher authority of the Duke of Somerset—'the worthy historians, the wise lawgivers, the vast concourse of witnesses, are all equally unavailing; *the spell is broken*—the evil spirits have vanished, and *these phantoms of discredited tradition* will not again revisit a more *experienced* and *incredulous* world:' whence we may infer that incredulity is the choicest fruit of experience! The whole witness of the Gospels on this subject is rejected as merely showing that 'the first three Evangelists shared the superstitious notions of their countrymen;' that 'these narratives belong to Jewish traditions, and *are rejected as traditional:*' from which we learn the curious canon of criticism that all traditions are to be rejected!"—Pp. 222, 223.

German Reviews.

Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Third number, 1872.—1. Overbeck, The Relation of Justin Martyr to the Acts. 2. Hilgenfeld, Peter in Rome and John in Asia Minor. 3. Lucht, The Incongruity between 2 Tim. iv, 20, and Acts xxi, 29. 4. Holtzmann, Luther's Birth-year, Once more.

Roman Catholics generally assert an episcopate of the Apostle Peter at Rome, lasting twenty-five years. It has been noted

as almost a miraculous fact that no bishop of Rome has since occupied the apostolical see for that length of time, and it has become a general belief that no Pope in future would rule the Church for twenty-five years until the last, under whom the appearance of the Antichrist and the end of the world will occur. While the present Pope lacks only a few more months to destroy this last-named illusion, historical science has long since shown the twenty-five years' episcopate to be a mere fiction. Even Catholic historians generally admit that the arguments in favor of this tradition do not rest on a solid foundation, and do not deny that Peter, though Bishop of Rome, must have spent a large portion of his time outside of that city. An impartial discussion of the question on the part of Roman Catholic writers is not possible, because the doctrine of the primacy of the Roman Bishop, and with it the corner-stone of the entire Roman Catholic system, cannot be possibly saved if Peter has not been the Bishop of Rome. Some Protestant scholars have even been led by their investigation of the question to the belief that Peter, so far from having been Bishop of Rome, has (so far as we can learn from the historical documents extant) never been at Rome at all. F. C. Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school, developed this theory with great learning in his work on the Apostle Paul, (2d edit., i, 246, sq.;) and more recently another scholar, who is generally recognized as one of the keenest explorers of the ancient history of the Christian Church, Prof. Lipsius, has fully indorsed this view, first in his work on the "Chronology of the Roman Bishops down to the Middle of the Fourth Century," (*Chronologie der Römischen Bishöfe*, Kiel, 1869,) and again in a treatise specially devoted to the subject, "The Sources of the Roman Tradition of Peter Critically Examined," (*Die Quellen der röm. Petrussage krotisch untersacht,* Kiel, 1872.) The well-known Church historian, Karl Hase, in his new "Manual of Protestant Polemics against the Roman Catholic Church," (*Handbuch der protest. Polemik*, 3d edit., Leips., 1871,) takes the same ground. Against them the editor of the Journal for Scientific Theology, Professor Hilgenfeld, though belonging to the same critical school as Professor Baur and Professor Lipsius, undertakes to prove that, according to the well-authenticated testimonies of ancient writers, Peter was really at Rome, as almost a miraculous fact that no bishop of Rome has since occupied the apostolical see for that length of time, and it has become a general belief that no Pope in future would rule the Church for twenty-five years until the last, under whom the appearance of the Antichrist and the end of the world will occur. While the present Pope lacks only a few more months to destroy this last-named illusion, historical science has long since shown the twenty-five years' episcopate to be a mere fiction. Even Catholic historians generally admit that the arguments in favor of this tradition do not rest on a solid foundation, and do not deny that Peter, though Bishop of Rome, must have spent a large portion of his time outside of that city. An impartial discussion of the question on the part of Roman Catholic writers is not possible, because the doctrine of the primacy of the Roman Bishop, and with it the corner-stone of the entire Roman Catholic system, cannot be possibly saved if Peter has not been the Bishop of Rome. Some Protestant scholars have even been led by their investigation of the question to the belief that Peter, so far from having been Bishop of Rome, has (so far as we can learn from the historical documents extant) never been at Rome at all. F. C. Baur, the founder of the Tubingen school, developed this theory with great learning in his work on the Apostle Paul, (2d edit., i, 246, sq.;) and more recently another scholar, who is generally recognized as one of the keenest explorers of the ancient history of the Christian Church, Prof. Lipsius, has fully indorsed the view, first in his work on the "Chronology of the Roman Bishops down to the Middle of the Fourth Century" (*Chronologie der Römischen Bischöfe*, Kiel, 1869,) and again in a treatise specially devoted to the subject, "The Sources of the Roman Tradition of Peter Critically Examined" (*Die Quellen der röm. Petrussage kritisch untersucht*, Kiel, 1872.) The well-known Church historian, Karl Hase, in his new "Manual of Protestant Polemics against the Roman Catholic Church" (*Handbuch der protest. Polemik*, 3d edit., Leips., 1871) takes the same ground. Against them the editor of the Journal for Scientific Theology, Professor Hilgenfeld, though belonging to the same critical school as Professor Baur and Professor Lipsius, undertakes to prove that, according to the well-authenticated testimonies of ancient writers, Peter was really at Rome and there suffered martyrdom. In the second part of his article Hilgenfeld refutes the arguments by which recently several theologians of the critical schools, like Keim, in his "History of Jesus," (vol. i, Zurich, 1867,) and Scholten, (*De Apostel Johannes in Klein-Azie*, Leiden, 1871,) have undertaken to prove that the Evangelist John is not the author of the Apocalypse, and that he is not the apostle of Asia Minor.

The birth-year of Luther has been for some time the subject of learned discussions in the theological journals of Germany. Recent discoveries and researches appear to establish the fact that the great reformer was not born, as has hitherto been stated in nearly all historical works, in the year 1483, but on November, 1487. The article by Holtzmann in this number of the "Journal for Scientific Theology" reviews the recent treatises on the subject, and, in particular, refutes the arguments adduced in favor of the former opinion by Kraake in the *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, (1872, p. 96.)

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1872. Second Number.—*Essays:* 1. PLITT, The Relation of the Theology of Schleiermacher to that of Zinzendorf. 2. KLOSTERMANN, The Song of Moses and Deuteronomy. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. RIEHM, The Original of the Pentateuch. 2. VAIHINGER, The Journey of the Israelites from Goshen to the Passage through the Red Sea. *Reviews:* 1. RITSCHLE'S Christian Doctrine of Justification and Atonement reviewed by SCHMIDT. 2. COSACK'S History of the Ascetical Literature, reviewed by ERBKAM. *Miscellaneous:* SCHNORR VON CAROLSFELD, Luther on his Birthyear.

Third Number.—*Essays:* 1. ROMANG, The Boundary Line between the Essential Principles of Christianity and the Christian Churches. 2. KLOSTERMANN, The Song of Moses and the Book of Deuteronomy. *Thoughts and Remarks:* RANKE, Discovery of New Fragments of the Itala. 2. FAUTH, The Availability of the Philosophy of Lotze for Theology. 3. BRANDES, The Christian's Assurance with regard to the Eternal Life. *Reviews:* 1. SEINEKE'S Evangelist of the Old Testament, (*Evangelist des Alten Testaments,*) reviewed by RIEHM. 2. LEIDSENS on Religious Education and on Religious Instruction in Public Schools, (*ueber Religiose Erziehung*, Carlsruhe, 1871,) reviewed by BRUCKNER.

The brief article, by Schnorr von Carolsfeld, on the birth-year of Luther, undertakes to show that Luther himself designates the year 1484, and not, as has hitherto been generally assumed, 1483, as his birth-year. The controversy, which has called forth quite a number of essays from learned German scholars, appears to be fully settled in favor of 1484.

The first article in the third number of the "Studien," by Romang, treats of a subject which has long since become for all Protestant State Churches of Europe the most important of all questions. Will it much longer be possible that those who profess the principles of the old evangelical Protestantism con-

tinue to remain united in one religious communion with those who believe Jesus to have been in no way more than a man, and who are avowed Deists or Pantheists? In Germany, Switzerland, Austria, France, and, more or less, also in other countries of Europe, it is common to find in the same congregation of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Evangelical Churches men sharing the principles of Luther and the Reformers of the sixteenth century united with men who do not disown their sympathy with the views of Strauss, Renan, and other representatives of the critical school. Only a few representatives of the liberal views have, like Strauss, acknowledged that their views place them outside of the pale of Christianity. The great majority remain inside of the Protestant Churches, in many cases as pastors, professors of theology, and high officers of the Church, and lay claim to the enjoyment of equal rights with the orthodox party. Thus it occurs that the orthodox Protestants in many congregations have to attend divine worship conducted by Deists or Pantheists, and have to send their children to schools in which the teacher of religion endeavors to eradicate from the youthful minds the belief in the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, and all other fundamental doctrines of evangelical Protestantism, as obsolete superstitions. Such a state of things is obviously too abnormal to last long. Thus far both parties, the evangelical as well as the liberal, have been reluctant to cut the union, because a radical disunion must be attended by a separation between Church and State, a solution which men of all parties who accept salaries from the State desire to avoid. The orthodox party, however, begins to see more and more clearly that these antagonistic elements in the Church cannot remain united much longer, and they are making their preparation for the final separation. Probably one of the greatest difficulties which will present itself when the attempt to effect the separation shall actually be made will be the division of the Church property.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historical Theology.) 1872. Third Number.—1. New Contributions to the Correspondence of the Reformers and their Friends; published by Dr. Brecher, Berlin. 2. [illegible], Biographical Sketch of Cælius Curio Secundus. 3. VOLZ, Contributions to a History of Pietism. 4. WALTE, Church History of Bremen at the time of the Reformation.

Professor Brecher, at Berlin, publishes in the first article a number of interesting letters from the great reformers of the sixteenth tinue to remain united in one religious communion with those who believe Jesus to have been in no way more than a man, and who are avowed Deists or Pantheists? In Germany, Switzerland, Austria, France, and, more or less, also in other countries of Europe, it is common to find in the same congregation of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Evangelical Churches men sharing the principles of Luther and the Reformers of the sixteenth century united with men who do not disown their sympathy with the views of Strauss, Renan, and other representatives of the critical school. Only a few representatives of the liberal views have, like Strauss, acknowledged that their views place them outside of the pale of Christianity. The great majority remain inside of the Protestant Churches, in many cases as pastors, professors of theology, and high officers of the Church, and lay claim to the enjoyment of equal rights with the orthodox party. Thus it occurs that the orthodox Protestants in many congregations have to attend divine worship conducted by Deists or Pantheists, and have to send their children to schools in which the teacher of religion endeavors to eradicate from the youthful minds the belief in the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, and all other fundamental doctrines of evangelical Protestantism, as obsolete superstitions. Such a state of things is obviously too abnormal to last long. Thus far both parties, the evangelical as well as the liberal, have been reluctant to cut the union, because a radical dissolution must be attended by a separation between Church and State, a solution which men of all parties who accept salaries from the State desire to avoid. The orthodox party, however, begins to see more and more clearly that these antagonistic elements of the Church cannot remain united much longer, and they are making their preparation for the final separation. Probably one of the greatest difficulties which will present itself when the attempt to effect the separation shall actually be made will be the division of the Church property.

Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie. (Journal for Historical Theology.) 1875. Third Number.—1. New Contributions to the Correspondence of the Reformers and their Friends; published by Dr. Brecher. [illegible] 2. [illegible] Biographical Sketch of [illegible] 3. [illegible] a History of Pietism. 4. Walte, Church History of Bremen at the time of the Reformation.

Professor Brecher, at Berlin, publishes in the first article a number of interesting letters from the great reformers of the century, which thus far have not been known. Among these letters are five from Luther, sixteen from Melanchthon, and several addressed to Luther and Melanchthon by their friends. In the second article a biographical sketch is given of one of the most prominent Italians who in the sixteenth century labored for the success of the Reformation. As many of the letters of Curio Secundus, who was professor at the University of Basel, still remain unprinted in the archives of Berne, Zurich, and Basel, which are supposed to shed new light on his reformatory labors, the author promises a second article on the subject after he shall have found time to study these letters.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Old Catholic Church movement in Germany and Austria has for some time failed to make any notable progress, and many papers which at first expected that it might deal a fatal blow to the papal and ultramontane system, acknowledge that they have been disappointed. The submission of Bishop Strossmyer, of Sirmium in Croatia, to the decrees of the Vatican Council is announced, and thus the Pope has the satisfaction of having coerced all the Bishops of Germany, Austria, and Hungary, of whom originally a large majority were opposed to the dogmatization of papal infallibility, into submission. The attitude of the Governments of Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and the other States, with regard to the movement, continues to be undecided. None of them sympathize with the theories which have been sanctioned by the Vatican Council, and which now all the Bishops try to enforce; they appear, however, to be afraid of placing the Old Catholics on an entirely equal footing before the law. Among the leaders of the Catholic movement there are far-going differences of opinion. Dr. Döllinger, who on March 20 closed an interesting series of lectures on the reunion of the Catholic, Eastern, and Protestant Churches, is much more conservative than any of the other prominent Old Catholics, and in the efforts for consolidating and perpetuating the Old Catholic Church he takes no active part. He rejects every secession from the Catholic Church; as for himself, he declares that he will ever remain a member of this Church. In his opinion there can be only one Catholic Church, and the State Governments can never recognize two. The reformation can only be carried through within the Church. If the Church refuses to the Old Catholics the consolations of religion and the sacraments, temporary missions may be established for their religious needs; but the final triumph of their principles they must expect from new Œcumenical Councils. If the century, which thus far have not been known. Among these letters are five from Luther, sixteen from Melanchthon, and several addressed to Luther and Melanchthon by their friends. In the second article a biographical sketch is given of one of the most prominent Italians who in the sixteenth century labored for the success of the Reformation. As many of the letters of Curio Secundus, who was professor at the University of Basel, still remain unprinted in the archives of Berne, Zurich, and Basel, which are supposed to shed new light on his reformatory labors, the author promises a second article on the subject after he shall have found time to study these letters.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Old Catholic Church movement in Germany and Austria has for some time failed to make any notable progress, and many persons who at first expected that it might deal a fatal blow to the papal and ultramontane system, acknowledge that they have been disappointed. The submission of Bishop Strossmayer, of Sirmium in Croatia, to the decrees of the Vatican Council is announced, and thus the Pope has the satisfaction of having coerced all the Bishops of Germany, Austria, and Hungary, of whom originally a large majority were opposed to the dogmatization of papal infallibility, into submission. The attitude of the Governments of Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and the other States, with regard to the movement, continues to be undecided. None of them sympathize with the doctrines which have been sanctioned by the Vatican Council, and which now all the Bishops try to enforce; they appear, however, to be afraid of placing the Old Catholics on an entirely equal footing before the law. Among the leaders of the Catholic movement there are diverging differences of opinion. Dr. Döllinger, who on March 20 closed an interesting series of lectures on the reunion of the Catholic, Eastern, and Protestant Churches, is much more conservative than any of the other prominent Old Catholics, and in the efforts for consolidating and perpetuating the Old Catholic Church he takes no active part. He rejects every secession from the Catholic Church; as for himself, he declares that he will ever remain a member of this Church. In his opinion there can be only one Catholic Church, and the State Governments can never recognize two. The reformation can only be carried through within the Church. If the Church refuses to the Old Catholics the consolations of religion and the sacraments, temporary missions may be established for their religious needs; but the final triumph of their principles they must expect from a new Œcumenical Council. In the advice of Dr. Döllinger would be generally followed, the Old Catholic movement would soon become extinct. But he stands almost alone, and all other leading Old Catholics are active in the extension and consolidation of the new Church. Attention is chiefly directed to the organization of those who are known to sympathize with the movement into regular congregations, which have their own ministers and regular celebration of divine worship. In this respect it appears that considerable progress continues to be made. Every month makes a number of additions to the list of Old Catholic congregations, some of which have a large membership. From the facts which are recorded in the "Rheinische Mercur," of Cologne, the principal organ of the Church, we see that there are quite a number of congregations which have upward of four hundred active members. In several towns the Old Catholic congregations are much larger than the Catholic. Sympathizers with the movement still appear to be found in every Catholic town and village; but it requires a special impulse to prevail upon them to take the decisive step of uniting into separate congregations. Frequently the proceedings of fanatical priests against Old Catholics provoke the separation. Thus, when in Boppard, a town on the Rhine, a fanatical priest ordered two excommunicated Old Catholic professors of the University of Bonn out of the Church, a number of the most influential inhabitants of the town, with the mayor at their head, immediately concluded to establish an Old Catholic congregation. This latent sympathy with the Old Catholic cause, which is believed to exist more or less in every Catholic congregation of Germany, constitutes the chief hope of the leaders of the movement that it will yet become a grand success. Some interesting facts of the last month are cited which appear indeed to confirm this hope. A General Assembly of the Old Catholics of the Grand Duchy of Baden, held at Offenburg on April 14, was attended by delegates from Heidelberg, Mannheim, Carlsruhe, Freiburg, Bruchsal, Pforzheim, Rastatt, Durlach, and nearly every town of the Grand Duchy, and, in general, embraced more than two thousand persons. In several dioceses, and especially in that of Rottenburg, (embracing the whole kingdom of Wurtemburg,) of which the learned Dr. Hefele is Bishop, no action has been taken against the professors and priests who are known to refuse submission to the decrees of the Vatican Council. The "Rheinische Mercur," which we have already quoted, states the remarkable fact that all the theological professors of the University of Tübingen, and several professors of the Episcopal Seminary of Rottenburg, remain steadfast in refusing the recognition of papal infallibility. At the University of Freiburg, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, fully one half of the theological professors are said to be determined opponents of the papal infallibility, while the remainder base their readiness to submit solely on the desire not to disturb the unity of the Church. In September the second General Old Catholic Congress will be held in Cologne. Its success or failure may to a large extent decide the progress of the movement in Germany and Austria.

Of the other countries of Europe comparatively little has been reported during the last three months. The canon of Paris, to whom we referred advice of Dr. Döllinger would be generally followed, the Old Catholic movement would soon become extinct. But he stands almost alone, and all other leading Old Catholics are active in the extension and consolidation of the new Church. Attention is chiefly directed to the organization of those who are known to sympathize with the movement into regular congregations, which have their own ministers and regular celebration of divine worship. In this respect it appears that considerable progress continues to be made. Every month makes a number of additions to the list of Old Catholic congregations, some of which have a large membership. From the facts which are recorded in the "Rheinische Merkur," of Cologne, the principal organ of the Church, we see that there are quite a number of congregations which have upward of four hundred active members. In several towns the Old Catholic congregations are much larger than the Catholic. Sympathizers with the movement still appear to be found in every Catholic town and village; but it requires a special impulse to prevail upon them to take the decisive step of uniting into separate congregations. Frequently the proceedings of fanatical priests against Old Catholics provoke the separation. Thus, when in Boppard, a town on the Rhine, a fanatical priest ordered two excommunicated Old Catholic professors of the University of Bonn out of the Church, a number of the most influential inhabitants of the town, with the mayor at their head, immediately concluded to establish an Old Catholic congregation. The secret sympathy with the Old Catholic cause, which is believed to exist more or less in every Catholic congregation of Germany, encourages the confident hope of the leaders of the movement that it will yet become a grand success. Some interesting facts of the last month are cited which appear indeed to confirm this hope. A General Assembly of the Old Catholics of the Grand Duchy of Baden, held at Offenburg on April 14, was attended by delegates from Heidelberg, Mannheim, Carlsruhe, Freiburg, Konstanz, Pforzheim, Rastatt, Durlach, and nearly every town of the Grand Duchy, and, in general, embraced more than two thousand persons. In several dioceses, and especially in that of Rottenburg, (embracing the whole kingdom of Wurtemberg,) of which the learned Dr. Hefele is Bishop, no action has been taken against the professors and priests who are known to refuse submission to the decrees of the Vatican Council. The "Rheinische Merkur," which we have already quoted, notes the remarkable fact that all the theological professors of the University of Tübingen, and several professors of the Episcopal Seminary of Rottenburg, remain steadfast in refusing the recognition of papal infallibility. At the University of Freiburg, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, fully one half of the theological professors are said to be determined opponents of the papal infallibility, while nevertheless they base their readiness to submit solely on the desire not to disturb the unity of the Church. In September the second General Old Catholic Congress will be held in Cologne. Its success or failure will to a very extent decide the progress of the movement in Germany and Austria.

Of the other countries of Europe comparatively little has been reported during the last three months. The clergy of Paris, to whom we referred in our last number, ("Methodist Quarterly Review," April, p. 334,) Abbé Michaud, is very active in behalf of Old Catholicism in the province of literature. He has, since February, 1872, published four pamphlets. In the fourth he develops at length his ideas of reform. He goes farther than most of the German Old Catholics, demanding an entire separation from the Church of Rome, a rejection of all that has been added to the Catholic doctrine since the ninth century, and a reunion with the Eastern Catholic Church. Besides Abbé Michaud, two canons of Bordeaux, Abbé Juncqua and Abbé Mouls, are the leaders of the movement in France. The former has been sentenced to six months' imprisonment for refusing to lay aside the ecclesiastical habit; the latter has gone to Brussels to inaugurate the movement in Belgium.

The most important event which during the last three months has occurred in the history of the Old Catholic Church is the progress which has been made in its relation to other ecclesiastical bodies. As none of the Roman Catholic bishops has yet dared to identify himself with the movement, the new Church is as yet without those heads which, according to its own doctrines, are indispensable for its continued existence. In view of this difficulty the Old Catholic parish priest, Renftle, of Mehring, in Bavaria, as early as May, 1871, applied to the Jansenist Church at Utrecht requesting that the Archbishop of Utrecht administer the sacrament of confirmation to the children of his congregation. The Archbishop, in reply, desired before acceding to the request to receive undoubted testimony of the orthodoxy of the Bavarian Old Catholics. As the Old Catholic Congress which was held in Munich in September was attended by delegates of the Jansenists, who expressed their full concurrence in the sentiments of the Old Catholics, the parish priest of Mehring in October directly addressed the Archbishop, asking him to come as soon as possible. In his reply, which was written in Latin, the Archbishop expressed a readiness to accede to the request, provided the Government of Bavaria would not put any obstacles in his way. Mr. Renftle, at his request, asked the Bavarian Government to give permission to the Archbishop of Utrecht to administer the sacrament. The reply of the Government, that it regarded itself as incompetent to meddle in matters purely spiritual, still did not disperse all the doubts of the Archbishop, who (February, 1872) desired to know whether, by performing episcopal functions in a Bavarian diocese, he did not violate any Bavarian law. This last doubt was also removed by a letter from the Old Catholic Central Committee, and when the canons of the Church of Utrecht, at a meeting held in May, approved of an episcopal visit of the Archbishop to Bavaria, the latter resolved to undertake the journey in July. The appearance of an archbishop among the German Old Catholics cannot fail to produce a sensation. The priests and the people who have joined the movement will for the first time feel that they are in the communion of a Church which retains all that they had regarded as essential elements of their religion, and has, on the other hand, been freed from all that had weighed them down as a burden. The first decisive step having been

In our last number, ("Methodist Quarterly Review," April, p. 324,) Abbé Michaud is very active in behalf of Old Catholicism in the province of literature. He has, since February, 1872, published four pamphlets. In the fourth he develops at length his ideas of reform. He goes farther than most of the German Old Catholics, demanding an entire separation from the Church of Rome, a rejection of all that has been added to the Catholic doctrine since the ninth century, and a reunion with the Eastern Catholic Church. Besides Abbé Michaud, two canons of Bordeaux, Abbé Junqua and Abbé Mouls, are the leaders of the movement in France. The former has been sentenced to six months' imprisonment for refusing to lay aside the ecclesiastical habit; the latter has gone to Brussels to inaugurate the movement in Belgium.

The most important event which during the last three months has occurred in the history of the Old Catholic Church is the progress which has been made in its relation to other ecclesiastical bodies. As none of the Roman Catholic bishops has yet dared to identify himself with the movement, the new Church is as yet without those heads which, according to its own doctrines, are indispensable for its continued existence. In view of this difficulty the Old Catholic parish priest, Renftle, of Mering, in Bavaria, as early as May, 1871, applied to the Jansenist Church at Utrecht requesting that the Archbishop of Utrecht administer the sacrament of confirmation to the children of his congregation. The Archbishop, in reply, desired before acceding to the request to receive undoubted testimony of the orthodoxy of the Bavarian Old Catholics. As the Old Catholic Congress which was held in Munich in September was attended by delegates of the Jansenists, who expressed their full concurrence in the sentiments of the Old Catholics, the parish priest of Mering in October directly addressed the Archbishop, asking him to come as soon as possible. In his reply, which was written in Latin, the Archbishop expressed a readiness to accede to the request, provided the Government of Bavaria would not put any obstacles in his way. Mr. Renftle, at his request, asked the Bavarian Government to give permission to the Archbishop of Utrecht to administer the sacrament. The reply of the Government, that it regarded itself as incompetent to meddle in matters purely spiritual, still did not disperse all the doubts of the Archbishop, who (February, 1872) desired to know whether, by performing episcopal functions in a Bavarian diocese, he did not violate any Bavarian law. This last doubt was also removed by a letter from the Old Catholic Central Committee, and when the canons of the Church of Utrecht, at a meeting held in May, approved of an episcopal visit of the Archbishop to Bavaria, the latter resolved to undertake the journey in July. The appearance of an archbishop among the German Old Catholics cannot fail to produce a sensation. The priests and the people who have joined the movement will for the first time feel that they are in the communion of a Church which retains all that they had regarded as essential elements of their religion, and has on the other hand, been freed from all that had weighed them down as a burden. The first decisive step having been taken, it may be expected that others, such as the organization of new dioceses and the appointment of bishops, will follow. This will probably be the occasion for many thousands who openly sympathize with the movement, but have not yet severed their connection with the Papal Church, to join the Old Catholic Church. Under these circumstances, friends and foes look forward with intense interest to the second Old Catholic Congress, which in September next will be held at Cologne. Preparations for this congress are even now made on a large scale, and, according to present appearances, it promises to be a great success.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

AMONG the recent German commentaries to the Old Testament, one, by A. Merx, on the book of Job (*Das Gedicht von Hiob.* Jena, 1871) is commended for the keenness of its investigations on the history of the text, and on the metrical form. The author is already known by several exegetical works, and is the editor of a periodical specially devoted to the study of the Old Testament.

Professor Hitzig, of Heidelberg, the learned Orientalist and exegetical writer, has published a very learned essay on the languages of Assyria. (*Sprache und Sprachen Assyricus.* Leipzig, 1871.) Hitzig highly commends the labors of Rawlinson, Hincks, and Morris, while his opinion of the works of Oppert are less favorable.

The History of the Times of the New Testament, (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.* Heidelberg, vol. ii, 1872,) by Professor Hausrath, of Heidelberg, is one of the most important works which have of late been published from the stand-point of the Tübingen school. The first volume, which treated of the times of Christ, appeared in 1868. The second volume, which completes the work, and has just appeared, is devoted to the times of the apostles. The first three sections describe the religious and political condition of the Roman empire with special reference to the Jews; the two following sections treat of the first growth of Christianity, and the last four of the Apostle Paul.

ITALY.

One of the most prominent writers of the order of Jesuits, Father Matteo Liberatore, published some time ago a series of articles on the relation between Church and State in the Civilta Cattolica. These articles attracted great attention, for the paper which published them is regarded as the semi-official organ of the Pope, who repeatedly has recognized the zeal of the editors for the defense of sound principles, and given to the theories which they advocate his infallible indorsement. Thus the articles of Father Liberatore, which have recently been republished in book form at Naples, (*La Chiesa e lo Stato.* 1871,) are of great interest for all taken, it may be expected that others, such as the reorganization of new dioceses and the appointment of bishops, will follow. This will probably be the occasion for many thousands who openly sympathize with the movement, but have not yet severed their connection with the Papal Church, to join the Old Catholic Church. Under these circumstances, friends and foes look forward with intense interest to the second Old Catholic Congress, which in September next will be held at Cologne. Preparations for this congress are even now made on a large scale, and, according to present appearances, it promises to be a great success.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Among the recent German commentaries on the Old Testament, one, by A. Merx, on the book of Job (*Das Gedicht von Hiob.* Jena, 1871) is commended for the keenness of its investigations on the history of the text, and on the metrical form. The author is already known by several exegetical works, and is the editor of a periodical specially devoted to the study of the Old Testament.

Professor Hitzig, of Heidelberg, the learned Orientalist and exegetical writer, has published a very learned essay on the languages of Assyria (*Sprache und Sprachen Assyriens.* Leipzig, 1871). Hitzig highly estimates the labors of Rawlinson, Hincks, and Norris, while his opinions of the works of Oppert are less favorable.

The History of the Times of the New Testament, (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.* Heidelberg, vol. ii, 1872,) by Professor Hausrath, of Heidelberg, is one of the most important works which have of late been published from the stand-point of the Tübingen school. The first volume, which treated of the times of Christ, appeared in 1868. The second volume, which completes the work, and has just appeared, is devoted to the times of the apostles. The first three sections describe the religious and political condition of the Roman empire with special reference to the Jews; the two following sections treat of the first growth of Christianity and the last four of the Apostle Paul.

ITALY.

One of the most prominent writers of the order of Jesuits, Father Matteo Liberatore, published some time ago a series of articles on the relations between Church and State in the Civiltà Cattolica. These articles attracted great attention, for the paper which published them is esteemed as the semi-official organ of the Pope, who repeatedly has expressed his [illegible]ment of the editors for the defense of sound principles, and given to the doctrines which they advocate his infallible endorsement. Thus the articles of Father Liberatore, which have recently been republished in book form at Naples, (*La Chiesa e lo Stato.* 1872,) are of great interest to who desire to know the views at present entertained by the papal court concerning its relations to the secular governments. We quote a few passages from this book; they are an interesting addition to the valuable collection of similar documents which several years ago was published in Dr. M'Clintock's work on "The Temporal Power." They must make it clear to every American citizen what would become of the Constitution and the laws of our country if ever the Catholic bishops should succeed in obtaining a controlling influence upon the majority of our people.

The supreme principle from which Liberatore starts, and which he repeats on almost every page of his book, is that of the superiority of the Church to the State. "The true Catholicism," he says, "maintains the necessity of a harmony between the State and the Church, but of a harmony which proceeds from the subordination of the State to the Church," (pp. 17, 33, 79.) In consequence of this subordination the State has to put the civil laws into agreement with the canonical, and to make the former serviceable to the execution of the latter, (p. 81.) Only in those things which directly refer to the mere well-being of the terrestrial life, as finances, army, commerce, peace among the citizens, relations to other nations, the State acts independently and as a sovereign power. In all things which directly concern piety, justice, and morals, the State must adopt the rules which have been dictated by the Church. Even in those things which we have designated as belonging within the province of the State, the State has the duty to do nothing that might be injurious to the morality of the subjects, or to the obedience due to God, or that in any way may be contrary to the spiritual welfare of the nations, (p. 119.) Should the contrary take place, the Church has the right to correct and annul every thing unjust or immoral that has been ordered by the secular power. The State has no indirect power over the Church, but the Church has an indirect power over the State with regard to every thing belonging to the purely secular province. Therefore the Church can correct and annul the civil laws, and the sentences of the secular courts, whenever they are contrary to the spiritual welfare. It has also the right to check the abuse of the executive power and of arms, or order them to be used when the defense of the Christian religion demands it, (pp. 43, 296.) Thus all the Popes have acted down to Pius IX., who repeatedly has censured and annulled laws passed by the modern parliaments of Europe, (p. 120.) Without doubt, the relation of every Christian to the Pope is one more intimate than that to the secular governments, (pp. 34–37.) The individual and the family have, in an absolute sense, no moral duty to enter into a civil community, and to remain in it; on the contrary, every man, every family, every people, has the imperative duty to enter into the communion of the Catholic Church, and to remain in it, and to submit to the authority of the head of the Church, upon penalty of eternal damnation, (p. 278.) The Christian peoples, to whatever nation they may belong, be they Italians, Germans, or Frenchmen, if they are subjects of the king or emperor with regard to temporal affairs, are subjects of the Pope with regard to spiritual affairs; yea, subjects of the Pope to a higher degree than subjects of the who desire to know the views at present entertained by the papal court concerning its relations to the secular governments. We quote a few passages from this book; they are an interesting addition to the valuable collection of similar documents which several years ago was published in Dr. M'Clintock's work on "The Temporal Power." They must make it clear to every American citizen what would become of the constitution and the laws of our country if ever the Catholic bishops should succeed in obtaining a controlling influence upon the majority of our people.

The supreme principle from which Liberatore starts, and which he repeats on almost every page of his book, is that of the superiority of the Church to the State. "The true Catholic doctrine," he says, "maintains the necessity of a harmony between the State and the Church, but of a harmony which proceeds from the subordination of the State to the Church" (pp. 17, 23, 79.) In consequence of this subordination the State has to put the civil laws into agreement with the canonical, and to make the former serviceable to the execution of the latter, (p. 81.) Only in those matters which directly refer to the mere well-being of the terrestrial life, as finances, army, commerce, peace among the citizens, relations to other nations, the State acts independently and as a sovereign power. In all things which directly concern piety, justice, and morals, the State must adopt the rules which have been dictated by the Church. Even in those things which we have designated as belonging within the province of the State, the State has the duty to do nothing that might be injurious to the morality of the subjects, or to the obedience due to God, or that in any way may be contrary to the spiritual welfare of the nations, (p. 130.) Should the contrary take place, the Church has the right to correct and annul every thing unjust or immoral that has been ordered by the secular power. The State has no indirect power over the Church, but the Church has an indirect power over the State with regard to every thing belonging to the purely secular province. Therefore the Church can correct and annul the civil laws, and the sentences of the secular courts, whenever they are contrary to the spiritual welfare. It has also the right to check the abuse of the executive power and of arms, or order them to be used when the defense of the Christian religion demands it. (pp. 43, 295.) Thus all the Popes have acted down to Pius IX., who repeatedly has censured and annulled laws passed by the modern parliaments of Europe, (p. 129.) Without doubt, the relation of every Christian to the Pope is one more intimate than that to the secular governments. (pp. 31-37.) The individual and the family have, in an absolute sense, no moral duty to enter into a civil community, and to remain in it; on the contrary, every man, every family, every people, has the imperative duty to enter into the communion of the Catholic Church, and to remain in it, and to submit to the authority of the head of the Church upon penalty of eternal damnation, (p. 280.) The Christian peoples, to whatever nation they may belong, be they Italians, Germans, or Frenchmen, if they are subjects of the King, or emperor, with regard to temporal affairs, are subjects of the Pope with regard to spiritual affairs; yes, subjects of the Pope to a higher degree than subjects of the king or emperor, if it is true that the aim of the Church is one more sublime than that of the State, and that a divine institution is of higher value than the human, (p. 292.) That relation between Church and State in which the latter is subordinate to the former, as it was in the Middle Ages, (p. 163,) is the normal relation. It is not a normal condition if a State finds itself in the necessity to tolerate non-Catholic forms of worship, and to concede to non-Catholics as well as to Catholics equal rights and the public profession of their religion. When the unity of faith has long been lost, and where other forms of worship besides the Catholic have for a long time been in the quiet enjoyment of equal rights, prudence commands the civil toleration of all forms of worship, (p. 75.) In such a case freedom of conscience is a lesser evil; in itself it is injurious, (p. 52.) As the individual, the State also has the duty to adopt the true religion, and after its adoption to guarantee its quiet possession to the subjects by forbidding the admission of false religions, (p. 71.) The objection, that if Catholic States have the right to forbid other forms of worship, heterodox and infidel States have the right to forbid the Catholic Church, is repelled by the argument that the error cannot have equal rights with the truth, (p. 67.) The immunity of the clergy is a divine right, which, therefore, the Church itself cannot abrogate, but only modify. To an infidel prince who would ask to be baptized, but would not be willing to introduce in his dominion the immunity of the clergy, baptism should be refused, (p. 386.) The clergy, according to divine right, is exempt from the jurisdiction of the secular princes, and subject to that of the Pope alone. (p. 383.)

These extracts sufficiently show that Father Liberatore in unmistakable terms professes the doctrine that the Pope of Rome is the sovereign of the entire Christian world, who has a right to set aside the laws of any State which are not in accord with the canonical laws of the Church. The book, as might be expected, has been indorsed by leading ultramontane organs in every country.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A New Treatise upon Regeneration in Baptism. By WILLIAM ADAMS, D.D. 8vo., pp. 384. Hartford, Conn.: The Church Press, H. Mallory & Co. 1871.

The position of Dr. Adams, and the "Church Press" from which his goodly volume issues, indicate that he is one who speaks as an authority for his Church. He writes professedly under the pressure of a deep feeling that his Church, being "*yet* a minority in this land," (and, we may add, not traveling very fast into a majority,) its doctrine of Regeneration is "loaded down and overborne with prejudices and misconstructions. The very name king or emperor, if it is true that the aim of the Church is one more sublime than that of the State, and that a divine institution is of higher value than the human, (p. 292.) That relation between Church and State in which the latter is subordinate to the former, as it was in the Middle Ages, (p. 163,) is the normal relation. It is not a normal condition, if a State finds itself in the necessity to tolerate non-Catholic forms of worship, and to concede to non-Catholics as well as to Catholics equal rights and the public profession of their religion. When the unity of faith has long been lost, and where other forms of worship besides the Catholic have for a long time been in the quiet enjoyment of equal rights, prudence commands the civil toleration of all forms of worship, (p. 73.) In such a case freedom of conscience is a lesser evil; in itself it is injurious, (p. 72.) As the individual, the State also has the duty to adopt the true religion, and after its adoption to guarantee its quiet possession to the subjects by forbidding the admission of false religions, (p. 75.) The objection, that if Catholic States have the right to forbid other forms of worship, heterodox and infidel States have the right to forbid the Catholic Church, is repelled by the argument that the error cannot have equal rights with the truth, (p. 97.) The immunity of the clergy is a divine right, which, therefore, the Church itself cannot abrogate, but only modify. To an infidel prince who would ask to be baptized, but would not be willing to introduce in his dominion the immunity of the clergy, baptism should be refused, (p. 298.) The clergy, according to divine right, is exempt from the jurisdiction of the secular princes, and subject to that of the Pope alone. (p. 296.)

These extracts sufficiently show that Father Liberatore in unmistakable terms professes the doctrine that the Pope of Rome is the sovereign of the entire Christian world, who has a right to set aside the laws of any State which are not in accord with the canonical laws of the Church. The book, as might be expected, has been indorsed by leading ultramontane organs in every country.

Art. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A New Treatise upon Regeneration in Baptism. By William Adams, D.D. 8vo. pp. 281. Hartford, Conn.: The Church Press, M. H. Mallory & Co. 1871.

The position of Dr. Adams, and the "Church Press" from which his goodly volume issues, indicate that he is one who speaks as an authority for his Church. He writes professedly under the pressure of a deep feeling that his Church, being "yet a minority in the land" (and, we may add, not traveling very fast into majority,) its doctrine of Regeneration is "loaded down and overborne with prejudices and misconstructions. The very name of Baptismal Regeneration is made odious and hateful." Over and over again he expatiates on the contempt with which his Church and this doctrinal specialty are treated; and he proposes to offer this extended work to vindicate both, and to show that, rightly understood, the doctrine is authorized by Scripture, is traditional in the general historical Church, is maintained by all the Anglican standards, and is productive of a true evangelic piety.

Dr. Adams is an earnest, and doubtless very sincere and truly pious, writer. He is severe upon opposite doctrines, but generous to his opponents, giving them full and cordial credit, when deserved, for learning, ability, and Christian piety. He hates Calvinism nearly as earnestly as it deserves to be morally hated, but is magnanimous to the great Genevan himself and to his pious followers. He is clear, copious, and sometimes eloquent in his style, yet sometimes prolix, rambling, and, not unfrequently, declamatory.

We think the doctrine, as maintained by Dr. Adams in behalf of the American-Anglican Church, is fairly thus stated. While *conversion* is the sinner's *turning* by repentance and faith from Satan to God, *regeneration* is the act of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, renewing it by the impartation of a supernatural divine life. A man confesses repentance and conversion; thereupon the clergyman baptizes him, and simultaneously the Holy Spirit bestows the inward regenerating grace. Thereby we know by visible presentation the *time* when a man is regenerated. The Church having thus regenerated him through the Spirit's power, takes him, nurses him with the word, with her sacraments and her discipline, and trains him for heaven. If he forfeit not by sin the grace received by baptism, he will not fail of a crown of glory.

We agree in nearly every point with Dr. Adams. His statement of the distinction between conversion and regeneration, of the subsequence of the latter to the former, and of the nature of the latter, we fully indorse. We believe with him in the close correlation between baptism and regeneration as sign and thing signified; in the proper co-existence of the two. We believe that in every rightly-performed baptism the Holy Spirit does a blessed work upon the soul. Our Saviour's words, *Except a man be born of water*, do justify the fathers in calling baptism, in an external sense, a *regeneratio*. But this point, namely, that after repentance and conversion the Holy Spirit waits for baptism in order to regenerate the soul, so that the baptism of Baptismal Regeneration is made odious and hateful." Over and over again he expatiates on the contempt with which his Church and this doctrinal specialty are treated; and he proposes to offer this extended work to vindicate both, and to show that, rightly understood, the doctrine is authorized by Scripture, is traditional in the general historical Church, is maintained by all the Anglican standards, and is productive of a true evangelic piety.

Dr. Adams is an earnest, and doubtless very sincere and truly pious, writer. He is severe upon opposite doctrines, but generous to his opponents, giving them full and cordial credit, when deserved, for learning, ability, and Christian piety. He hates Calvinism nearly as earnestly as it deserves to be morally hated, but is magnanimous to the great Genevan himself and to his pious followers. He is clear, copious, and sometimes eloquent in his style, and sometimes prolix, rambling, and, not unfrequently, declamatory.

We think the doctrine, as maintained by Dr. Adams in behalf of the American-Anglican Church, is fairly thus stated. While conversion is the sinner's turning, by repentance and faith, from Satan to God, regeneration is the act of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, renewing it by the impartation of a supernatural divine life. A man confesses repentance and conversion; thereupon the clergyman baptizes him, and simultaneously the Holy Spirit bestows the inward regenerating grace. Thereby we know by visible presentation the time when a man is regenerated. The Church having thus regenerated him through the Spirit's power, takes him, nurses him with the word, with her sacraments and her discipline, and trains him for heaven. If he forfeit not by sin the grace received by baptism, he will not fail of a crown of glory.

We agree in nearly every point with Dr. Adams. His statement of the distinction between conversion and regeneration, of the subsequence of the latter to the former, and of the nature of the latter, we fully indorse. We believe with him in the close correlation between baptism and regeneration as sign and thing signified; in the proper co-existence of the two. We believe that in every rightly-performed baptism the Holy Spirit does a blessed work upon the soul. Our Saviour's words, *Except a man be born of water, &c.*, do justify the fathers in calling baptism, in an external sense, a *regeneration*. But this point, namely, that after repentance and conversion the Holy Spirit waits for baptism in order to regenerate the soul, so that the baptism and regeneration are appointedly always simultaneous, the former being the instrument operating the latter, we do not believe.

Dr. Adams proves abundantly and superabundantly that his is the actual and only doctrine of the Anglican Church. The so-called *evangelical* clergy who deny this fact sustain their denial by a system of very unevangelical quibbling. But when he comes to his *scripture proof* his failure is complete and absolute. The very strongest expression is that of St. Peter, (1 Pet. iii, 21,) "*Baptism doth now save us.*" These words do most literally declare that the act of water baptism not only regenerates, but that it effects our complete salvation. No text is more explicit. Yet mark how Peter immediately gives us a permanent law of exegesis which guards us against Dr. Adams's High-Church interpretation of all such words and passages: "*Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.*" When it is said, quoth Peter, that water baptism *saves* us, *regenerates* us, (Titus iii, 5,) *washes away our sins*, (Acts xxii, 16,) it means, not that the external rite actually *saves*, *regenerates*, or *washes*, but that it is the inward grace typified by the external rite which does really *save*, *regenerate*, and *wash*. In such passages the sign is used for the thing signified; or, more exactly still, the visible rite does formally, symbolically, and externally *wash*, *regenerate*, and *save* us, correspondently with the essential and internal *washing*, *regenerating*, and *saving* by the inward grace. Nor does any text nor any reason require that the sign and thing signified should be simultaneous acts. St. Peter's very purpose in these words was to *prevent the current phraseology of the New Testament Church from being interpreted into the ritualistic doctrine of "Baptismal Regeneration."* And it was most divinely fitting that St. Peter, claimed by Ritualism as her great head, should be the very apostle to pronounce the capital sentence against her.

Dr. Adams justly reprehends the various evasive and fantastic misinterpretations (quoted in Tholuck's Commentary) on John iii, 5, which he considers the fortress-text of his dogma. St. Peter's rule of exegesis completely explains that text. Our Lord's words beautifully blend the double baptismal induction into the double kingdom of God. Except a man be born externally by water he cannot enter into the external kingdom; except he be born internally by the Spirit he cannot enter into the internal and eternal kingdom. Baptism is the condition of induction into the kingdom: external baptism for the kingdom external, internal for the internal.

and regeneration are apparently always simultaneous, the former being the instrument operating the latter, we do not believe.

Dr. Adams proves abundantly and superabundantly that this is the actual and only doctrine of the Anglican Church. The so-called evangelical clergy who deny this fact sustain their denial by a system of very unevangelical quibbling. But when he comes to his scripture proof his failure is complete and absolute. The very strongest expression is that of St. Peter, (1 Pet. iii, 21,) "*Baptism doth now save us.*" These words do most literally declare that the act of water baptism not only regenerates, but that it effects our complete salvation. No text is more explicit. Yet mark how Peter immediately gives us a perpetual key of exegesis which guards us against Dr. Adams's High Church interpretation of all such words and passages: "*Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.*" When it is said, quoth Peter, that water baptism saves us, regenerates us, (Titus iii, 5,) washes away our sins, (Acts xxii, 16,) it means, not that the external rite actually saves, regenerates, or washes, but that it is the inward grace typified by the external rite which does really save, regenerate, and wash. In such passages the sign is used for the thing signified; or, more exactly still, the visible rite does formally, symbolically, and externally wash, regenerate, and save us, correspondently with the essential and internal washing, regenerating, and saving by the inward grace. Nor does any text nor any reason require that the sign and thing signified should be simultaneous acts. St. Peter's very purpose in these words was *to protect the correct phraseology of the New Testament Church from being misinterpreted into the ritualistic doctrine of "Baptismal Regeneration."* And it was most divinely fitting that St. Peter, claimed by Ritualism as her great head, should be the very apostle to pronounce the capital caution against her.

Dr. Adams justly repudiates the various evasive and forced misinterpretations (quoted in Tholuck's Commentary) on John iii, 5, which he considers the fortress text of his dogma. St. Peter's rule of exegesis completely explains that text. Our Lord's words beautifully blend the double baptismal induction into the double kingdom of God. Except a man be born externally by water he cannot enter into the external kingdom; except he be born internally by the Spirit he cannot enter into the internal and eternal kingdom. Baptism is the condition of induction into the kingdom; external baptism for the kingdom external, internal for the internal.

God-Man. By L. T. Townsend, D.D. Search and Manifestation. 12mo., pp. 446. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Dr. Townsend offers us an appropriation of the results of comparative theology in proof of the divinity of Christianity. It is too early to expect such a work should be completely done, but not premature for some free tentatives to be essayed. Indeed, he has been preceded in the attempt by Maurice Hardwicke, Freeman Clarke, and others. Hardwicke places Mosaicism, with its miracle, prophecy, and completeness of divine scheme, in superiority over every rival. Mr. Clarke maintains that every other religion has something good, yet lacks important somethings; while Christianity has all the good of each, with a fullness that lacks nothing. But with Mr. Clarke all religions ascend from man; none descend to man from God, except as the productive power for religion is placed by the Creator in man's nature. With Mr. Townsend religion goes not up from man, but truly comes down to man from God. Man's nature does not create, but gropes for, anticipates, receives, and verifies, the true religion. In the vast field of the ethnic systems he recognizes the great outlines of a true theology, of which Christianity is the true realization. His work is, therefore, divided into two parts, The Search and The Manifestation; the former, as shown in the history of Ethnic religions; the latter, as appearing in historic Christianity. His analysis of the vast mass of ethnic thought finds four leading Ideas, namely, God, Mediator, Incarnation, and Sacrifice. We were surprised that in this enumeration neither the ethical idea, including the sense of sin, nor the idea of immortality, including the doctrine of retribution, were included. This deficit is unsymmetrically supplied in a following chapter so far as the last idea is concerned, but the specification should be in its proper place. Then come some chapters in which the validity of his analysis as ascertaining an Essential Theology in the sum total of ethnic systems is maintained. We are then ready for the manifestation, in which the concrete of this Essential Theology is revealed.

From this vantage ground he takes a survey of Christ and Christianity which is fresh, somewhat original in its sweep, and very effective. The power of the author now finely appears in giving a new shape and fresh force to the evidences of Christianity. Christianity is not with him, as with Mr. Clarke, obliged to grope among rival religions, half doubtful whether they are not as good as she. No. From the high platform of Essential The-

God-Man. By L. T. Townsend, D.D. Search and Manifestation. 12mo., pp. 448. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1872.

Dr. Townsend offers us an approximation of the results of comparative theology in proof of the divinity of Christianity. It is too early to expect such a work should be completely done, but not premature for some few tentatives to be essayed. Indeed, he has been preceded in the attempt by Maurice, Hardwicke, Freeman Clarke, and others. Hardwicke places Christianity, with its miracle, prophecy, and completeness of divine scheme, in superiority over every rival. Mr. Clarke maintains that every other religion has something good, yet lacks important requisites; while Christianity has all the good of each, with a fullness that lacks nothing. But with Mr. Clarke all religions ascend from man; none descend to man from God, except so far as the productive power for religion is placed by the Creator in man's nature. With Mr. Townsend religion goes not up from man, but truly comes down to man from God. Man's nature does not create, but gropes for, anticipates, receives, and verifies, the true religion. In the vast field of the ethnic systems he accumulates the great outlines of a true theology, of which Christianity is the true realization. His work is, therefore, divided into two parts, The Search and The Manifestation; the former, as shown in the history of ethnic religions; the latter, as appearing in historic Christianity. His analysis of the vast mass of ethnic thought finds four leading ideas, namely, God, Mediator, Incarnation, and Sacrifice. We were surprised that in this enumeration neither the ethical idea, including the sense of sin, nor the idea of immortality, including the doctrine of retribution, were included. This defect is unsystematically supplied in a following chapter so far as the last idea is concerned, but the specification should be in its proper place. Then come some chapters in which the validity of his analysis as ascertaining an Essential Theology in the sum total of ethnic systems is maintained. We are then ready for the manifestation in which the concrete of this Essential Theology is revealed.

From this vantage ground he takes a survey of Christ and Christianity which is fresh, somewhat original in its sweep, and very effective. The power of the author now finely appears in giving a new shape and fresh force to the evidences of Christianity. Christianity is not with him, as with Mr. Clarke, obliged to grope among rival religions, half doubtful whether they are not as good as she. No. From the high platform of Essential Theology he uncompromisingly descries in Christ the Incarnation, the Mediator, the Sacrifice. It is solely upon the first of the three, however, he fixes, and exerts all his powers in demonstrating the God-man.

He analyses the *era* of Christ, and finds that it is a historic period. He examines the Gospel documents, and finds they are historic records. He examines the phenomena, and finds that Christ was a true man. He then interrogates the proofs for his divinity, and finds the *facts* in the documents, the apostolic opinions, the contemporaneous public opinion, Jesus' own personal testimony, the early Christian opinion, the estimates of modern rationalizers, and the Christian consciousness. From all these he obtains a body of testimony powerfully bearing upon his conclusion.

The work has many obvious defects in minor details which affect its merits rather as a work of art than of popular power. The first part of the book is entitled, The Search; and yet the ethnic systems are treated much less as an inquiry of the human mind (as they are by Maurice) than as a dogmatic intuitive theology; so that the two parts should be apparently rather entitled the Affirmation and its Realization.

Dr. Townsend's style is intuitive rather than logical; so inconsecutive as often to lapse into itemization; presenting a series of successive flashes, with frequent jets of vivid eloquence, rather than a current of fluent thought. He has the most abounding genius for quotation known in literature—quotation often pertinent and brilliant, and sustaining his point with great authority. He has adopted, however, an unfortunate rule of not referring his reader to the place in the quoted author, thus depriving us of the privilege of sipping at original fountains; and sometimes, perhaps, releasing himself from the responsibility of a scrupulous accuracy. We would like to know, for instance, where "Pliny speaks of Christians as 'pestilent fellows,'" and where "Juvenal uttered his bitterest satires against them," (p. 143;) and where Dugald Stewart affirmed Mill's doctrine solving innate ideas by association, (p. 151,) and whether Dr. Channing did not abundantly and "dogmatically" assert the mere humanity of Christ in, if our memory deceive us not, his sermon for Dr. Sparks at Baltimore to which Moses Stuart replied. But these lapses are very few in proportion to his immense amount of quotation.

Our author's writings make their mark, and appeal with power and effect to their correlative class of minds. They are bold, ology he unexceptionably describes in Christ the Incarnation, the Mediator, the Sacrifice. It is solely upon the first of the three, however, he fixes, and exerts all his powers in demonstrating the God-man.

He analyses the era of Christ, and finds that it is a historic period. He examines the Gospel documents, and finds they are historic records. He examines the phenomena, and finds that Christ was a true man. He then interrogates the proofs for his divinity, and finds the *facts* in the documents, the apostolic opinions, the contemporaneous public opinion, Jesus' own personal testimony, the early Christian opinion, the estimate of modern rationalism, and the Christian consciousness. From all these he obtains a body of testimony powerfully bearing upon his conclusion.

The work has many obvious defects in minor details which affect its merits rather as a work of art than of popular power. The first part of the book is entitled, The Search; and yet the ethnic systems are treated much less as an inquiry of the human mind (as they are by Maurice) than as a dogmatic intuitive theology; so that the two parts should be apparently rather entitled the Affirmation and its Verification.

Dr. Townsend's style is intuitive rather than logical; so inconsecutive as often to lapse into repetitions; presenting a series of successive flashes, with frequent jets of vivid eloquence, rather than a current of fluent thought. He has the most abounding genius for quotation known to literature—quotation often pertinent and brilliant, and sustaining his point with great authority. He has adopted, however, an unfortunate rule of not referring his reader to the place in the quoted author, thus depriving us of the privilege of sipping at original fountains; and sometimes perhaps, releasing himself from the responsibility of a complete accuracy. We would like to know, for instance, where "Pliny speaks of Christians as 'pestilent fellows,'" and where "Juvenal uttered his bitterest attacks against them," (p. 149) and where Dugald Stewart affirmed Mill's doctrine solving innate ideas by association, (p. 151,) and whether Dr. Channing did not "vehemently and "dogmatically" assert the mere humanity of Christ in a [illegible] our memory deceives us or not, his answer to Dr. Sparks as [illegible] more to which Moses Stuart replied. But these lapses are very few in proportion to his immense amount of quotation.

Our author's writings make their mark, and appeal with power and effect to their correlative class of minds. They are bold intrepid assaults into the camp of error. They are as magnanimous and liberal as they are bold. He has a public grateful for his achievements, and rejoicing to hear from him often.

Man and his Dwelling-Place. An Essay Toward the Interpretation of Nature. By JAMES HINTON, author of "Life in Nature," etc. 12mo., pp. 301. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

Mr. Hinton in the present volume seeks to base the doctrine of universal salvation in a unique blending of philosophy and Scripture interpretation. To the natural man, he tells us, external nature, including matter and its laws, appears hard and *dead.* This, he declares, is an illusion, for it is truly man himself that is *dead*, and nature is living and spiritual. Give man the true life and he will see that unvailed nature is spirit. This deadness of man to the life of nature is identical with that spiritual deadness described in the New Testament, by which man is insensate to God and holiness. Christ's mission of redemption is to awaken man to the true life. And the truly awakened and redeemed man, fully enlightened by Scripture and the Spirit, is enabled to see that under the vail of nature is the living Spirit, and that the temporal is truly the eternal. We are as truly *in eternity* before bodily death as after it. This redemption is completed by delivering man from his *self*, which is an emptiness and a defect, and filling him with God, by which he is elevated to a true personality.

And as *time* is really *eternity*, so truly eternal death and eternal life are not solely *in the future*, but *now.* The natural man is now in hell, and, alas! usually loves to be in hell. Death, by which we drop our own phenomenal covering, is but an incident in our ever-present eternity. Mr. Hinton challenges the production of a single passage of Scripture by which our redemption from spiritual death is limited to our state previous to our bodily death. The wicked are now in eternal damnation, and the righteous are now in eternal life, and so will both classes stay so long as the former remain in wickedness and the latter in righteousness. Dives and Lazarus are the names of characters rather than of men, or rather the names of men in opposite characters. They are the eternal antithesis of right and wrong exhibited in living concrete instances, and the gulf between them is the impassable contrariety of the opposing terms of that antithesis. Dives must cease to be Dives, Lazarus must cease to be Lazarus, before the opposite side of the gulf can be attained. Christ is pledged in the work of

redemption to bring all from the Dives to the Lazarus condition, and there is no fear that he will fail of the complete accomplishment of his great office.

Mr. Hinton holds this to be the true, the palpably and indisputably plain, doctrine of the New Testament and the New Testament Church. Very early, and very unhappily, the Church lost sight of this truth of universal complete redemption. Her eyes became dimmed by the mists from surrounding paganism, and she was induced to postpone eternity beyond death, and to see an immutable death for all who passed that limit in impenitence. Gradually she constructed her system of interpretation of words and phrases into this meaning, until she reads eternal personal misery into a body of texts innocent of such meaning, and reads universal redemption out of a revelation full of that glorious import. Mr. Hinton's book proposes to roll the revolution back, to destroy the destruction, and to restore the restoration.

Were Mr. Hinton, like John Murray, "the father of American Universalism," a flaming evangelist instead of a closeted thinker, we suspect that he could largely restore the pristine devoutness, and thereby much of the power and prevalence, of its original history. There is a spiritual glow in his style, a heartiness in his Christian feeling, well calculated to insinuate his sentiments into devout minds; yet while we can accept a Universalist who truly exhibits the fruits of the Spirit, we remain immovable in the belief that the prevalence of Universalism would be the prevalence first of a false life, and soon of a real death to the religion of the New Testament. Mr. Hinton's volume, to our view, untruly identifies the "spiritual death" of Paul's epistles with our perception of nature as phenomenal, and non-perception of its *noumenon.* And as it is from this false marriage that his system is born, it is an illegitimate birth. Thence he simply revolutionizes the New Testament by a revolutionary lexicography. Had his interpretation and system been that of the primitive Christian Church there would now be no Christian Church, for the history of American Universalism warns us that its dogma has little independent, self-sustaining, aggressive, and saving power. Its false life seems one half borrowed from the roots of the orthodoxy it antagonizes, and the other half made up of the zest of the antagonism. There are, we believe, men within its fold who cherish, and even draw from its dogma, a true Christian life; but as a system and a whole it shows little power of regenerating the world, or of assuming the universal salvation it promises.

Political Romanism; or, the Secular Policy of the Papal Church. By Rev. G. W. Hughey, A.M. 16mo., pp. 287. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

In a fresh and popular style Mr. Hughey here brings before us, briefly but conclusively, the position in which the Romish Church, clergy and people, stand in regard to our Republican Government and our liberties, both religious and political. He makes it as sure as a mathematical demonstration that a good papist cannot consistently be an American patriot. Between his oath of allegiance to the Pope and his oath of allegiance to our Government there is a collision of swearing and an insurance of perjury.

The right of the Pope to dominion over all the governments of the world and every individual of mankind, to rule them absolutely both soul and body, in things spiritual and things secular, is demonstrably a fundamental and immutable principle of the Romish Church. The Pope is the only existing claimant on earth to supreme dominion over mankind, to a universal absolute monarchy, and every Romanist by the very fact of being a Romanist concedes that claim; and, when the opportune moment comes to exert that supreme right, is solemnly bound to maintain it. The Pontiff claims for himself, and the whole Church maintains for him, the right derived from God as vicar of Christ, to abolish any existing government, and to establish instead any substitute government he thinks right. For that right has been asserted and exercised by Popes and Councils, and, since it is now the law of the Church that Popes are infallible, the claim to absolutism remains immutable as fate.

In the plenitude of his power Louis XIV. denied the absolute authority of Popes over Kings and kingdoms, affirming that Papal power was limited to spiritual matters alone. The Gallican Church for awhile maintained this limitation. The Papal bishops of America have exhibited Gallicanism to the American people as the true view. But the Popes from the beginning have denounced that doctrine, and the Gallican theory has been completely obliterated from the Church. The final establishment of the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope completely falsifies the pretense that he claims not supremacy over the entire life and estate, spiritual and secular, of every human being. There stand the documents and the facts in unequivocal meaning and irrevocable force. It is a claim that can never be withdrawn, canceled, or denied.

The Romanists are, therefore, among us an *imperium in imperio*, a political monarchy in a Republic, the devoted subjects of a foreign despot. They are religiously bound to vote or fight as he

dictates. Through our whole life we have seen the proof and result of this foreign allegiance in the solid massing of the Romish voters in one party. They vote not for our country but for their popedom. And even though it be granted that there is no imminent danger of their ascendancy in the nation, this very fact is good reason for vigilance, and for the active and wide circulation of the real state of the facts. Perhaps no volume upon the subject is better suited, by its clearness, brevity, and, conclusiveness for circulation than Mr. Hughey's "Political Romanism."

Jesus. By CHARLES F. DEEMS, Pastor of the Church of the Strangers. 12mo., pp. 756. United States Publishing Company, New York. 1872.

The great. Life was never a more fascinating subject for thinker and writer than at the present hour. Critics approach it from every point of the compass—Strauss, Renan, Schenkel, Beecher, Crosby, Deems. Perhaps no essay of the kind from the Christian side is more truly analytical than this of Dr. Deems. Simply assuming the historical validity of the four writers who furnish the earliest extant narratives, Dr. Deems's position is that of a critical inquirer. The correct text, its true meaning, the order of the events, the nature of the utterances, and the problems arising at every step, are all keenly investigated. The discussions are often bold, clear, and complete. The temptation, Satan, the demoniacs, the cause of the death of Christ, are among the deep queries that are fathomed with a long sounding-line. The result of the whole is firmly stated. He has by the light of the best guidances attainable written the life of the Incarnate. Like that is nothing else known in science or history.

The author's claims to freedom from prepossession, it will be said, are nugatory. If not his profession, yet his mental position renders his conclusion foregone. And it is doubtless true that none but an idiot's brain can approach a subject blank of prepossession. Certainly Strauss and Renan commenced with the primal pantheistic assumption that all miracle and all supernatural are falsehood. Dr. Deems, on the contrary, assumes the reality of the supernatural, and the possibility and, under due conditions, the probability of miracles. And then, if the supernatural is, and the miracle may be, all our nature demands that they appear in the great life of Jesus. This volume is, therefore, a searching inquiry whether the narratives contain any thing to invalidate that conclusion. The thousands who have listened with delight and dictates. Through our whole life we have seen the proud and result of this foreign allegiance in the solid massing of the Romish voters in one party. They vote not for our country, but for their popedom. And even though it be granted that there is no imminent danger of their ascendancy in the nation, this very fact is good reason for vigilance, and for the active and wide circulation of the real state of the facts. Perhaps no volume upon the subject is better suited, by its clearness, brevity, and conclusiveness for circulation than Mr. Hughey's "Political Romanism."

Jesus. By Charles F. Deems, Pastor of the Church of the Strangers. 12mo, pp. 156. United States Publishing Company, New York. 1872.

The great Life was never a more fascinating subject for thinker and writer than at the present hour. Critics approach it from every point of the compass—Strauss, Renan, Schenkel, Beecher, Crosby, Deems. Perhaps no essay of the kind from the Christian side is more truly analytical than this of Dr. Deems. Simply assuming the historical validity of the four writers who furnish the earliest extant narratives, Dr. Deems's position is that of a trained inquirer. The correct text, its true meaning, the order of the events, the nature of the utterances, and the problems arising at every step, are all keenly investigated. The discussions are often bold, clear, and complete. The temptation, Satan, the demoniacs, the cause of the death of Christ, are among the deep queries that are fathomed with a long sounding-line. The result of the whole is firmly stated. He has by the light of the best guidance attainable written the life of the Incarnate. Like that is nothing else known in science or history.

The author's claims to freedom from prepossession, it will be said, are nugatory. If not his profession, yet his mental position renders his conclusion foregone. And it is doubtless true that none but an idiot's brain can approach a subject blank of prepossession. Certainly Strauss and Renan commenced with the pivotal pantheistic assumption that all miracle and all supernatural are falsehood. Dr. Deems, on the contrary, assumes the reality of the supernatural, and the possibility and, under due conditions, the probability of miracles. And then, if the supernatural is, and the miracle may be, all our nature demands that they appear in the great life of Jesus. This volume is, therefore, a searching inquiry whether the narratives contain any thing to invalidate that conclusion. The thousands who have listened with delight and profit to the writer's pulpit performances will experience no disappointment in the perusal of these pages.

We know but one blemish in the book. The author quotes with credence from the forged "Blue Laws" of Connecticut the preposterous enactment that no woman shall kiss her child on Sunday. Popular tradition also says that the beer barrel was to be whipped for *working* on that day. Both, we take it, are equally authentic, and either illustrates equally well the vitality of a lie.

Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. Vol. IV, H, I, J. 8vo., pp. 1,122. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Plentiful use of the volumes of this work thus far issued enables us to say that those who have other sacred dictionaries will still need this, and those who have this are likely to fall into the habit of neglecting the others. When finished it will be a library. It should be absent from no full library. If our Church should furnish, as we hope before many years she will, an outline library for every ministerial charge, this would take its place at the core of the catalogue.

The volume opens with a most appropriate memorial page, dedicated to its late Editor, Dr. M'Clintock. The preface apprises us that while the entire editorial responsibility now devolves on Dr. Strong, he is so amply aided by the remaining products of Dr. M'Clintock, as well as by the continued labors of Professor Worman and Professor Schem, that no fear need be entertained of the adequate completion of the entire work. Besides a liberal, yet honorably crediting and freely modifying, use of the labors of standard predecessors, in both the English and German languages, fully one half the matter is now for the first time brought into sacred cyclopedia. So amazing an amount of labor amply accounts for what some might, though we do not, think the slow succession of the volumes. Though the editors are Methodists, yet of the near seventy contributors, all of whose names are given on a single page, and each of whose initials are affixed to his own contributions, not more than one third belong to the same communion. All that the work gains from the denominational position of the editors is that, for the first time in such a work, their views are fairly treated with the rest. The present volume contains more than one hundred truly illustrative engravings, gathered from a truly encyclopedic research, and, to a large extent, fresh to the present readers. The articles are profit to the writer's pulpit performances will experience no disappointment in the perusal of these pages.

We know but one blemish in the book. The author quotes with credence from the forged "Blue Laws" of Connecticut the preposterous enactment that no woman shall kiss her child on Sunday. Popular tradition also says that the beer barrel was to be whipped for working on that day. Both, we take it, are equally authentic, and either illustrates equally well the vitality of a lie.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. Vol. IV. H, I, J, K. 8vo., pp. 1,122. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Plentiful use of the volumes of this work thus far issued enables us to say that those who have other general dictionaries will still need this, and those who have this are likely to fall into the habit of neglecting the others. When finished it will be a library. It should be absent from no full library. If our Church should furnish, as we hope before many years she will, an outfit library for every ministerial charge, this would take its place at the core of the catalogue.

The volume opens with a most appropriate memorial piece dedicated to its late Editor, Dr. M'Clintock. The preface apprises us that while the entire editorial responsibility now devolves on Dr. Strong, he is so amply aided by the remaining products of Dr. M'Clintock, as well as by the continued labors of Professor Worman and Professor Schem, that no fear need be entertained of the adequate completion of the entire work. Besides a liberal, yet honorably crediting and freely modifying, use of the labors of standard predecessors, in both the English and German languages, fully one half the matter is new, for the first time brought into sacred cyclopedia. So amazing an amount of labor amply accounts for what some regret, though we do not, think the slow succession of the volumes. Though the editors are Methodists, yet of the near seventy contributors, all of whose names are given on a single page, and each of whose initials are affixed to his own contributions, not more than one-third belong to the same communion. All that the work gains from the denominational position of the editors is that, for the first time in such a work, their views are fairly treated with the rest. The present volume contains more than one hundred truly illustrative engravings, gathered from a truly encyclopedic research, and, to a large extent, fresh to the present readers. The article [illegible] models of clear condensation, with an abundant and sometimes, perhaps, superabundant body of references to the various authors who, in any language, have discussed the topic in hand. The work is invaluable to the sacred scholar, and an honor to American sacred scholarship.

The Church Idea. An Essay toward Unity. By WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON, Rector of All Saints, Worcester. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. 235. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1872.

Mr. Huntington is a remarkably graceful, spirited, and liberal writer, free from that effeminate parade by which much of the "Church" literature is characterized, alive to the stirring questions of the day, and earnest for the beneficent controlling influence of our common Christianity. His purpose is to show us how wisely and beneficially we may all become Episcopalians, and to show Episcopalians upon what outline-scheme of liberal comprehension the one Anglican-American Church may beneficently embrace all American Christianity. Dismissing all the incidentals, there are in his view but four essentials to a proper Anglican Church. Among these incidentals he thinks we may first unceremoniously dispense with those accessories which English life has clustered around the English Church: "a flutter of surplices, a vision of village spires and cathedral towers, a somewhat stiff and stately company of deans, prebendaries, and choristers." More valuable, and ever to be retained and diffused where possible, yet not absolutely essential, are the Thirty-nine Articles and the Liturgy. The four essentials which all must embrace, and which may embrace us all, are, The Holy Scriptures as God's word, The Primitive Creeds (the Apostles' and the Nicene) as rule of faith, The two Sacraments, and The Episcopate.

Now it is certain that our Methodist Episcopal Church has and heartily holds fast all these four essentials. Mr. Huntington will, indeed, courteously inform us that we lack what he considers an *essential* element to a *real* episcopacy, namely, the Apostolic Succession. That issue we are willing to have decided by the words of the founder of the Anglican system, Archbishop Cranmer.

Christianity and Modern Thought. 12mo., pp. 304. New York: James Miller, 617 Broadway. 1872.

"Modern thought," of course, gorgeously flaunts on the banner of our Unitarian friends.* We can, indeed, find the essentials of models of clear condensation, with an abundant, and sometimes, perhaps, superabundant body of references to the various authors who, in any language, have discussed the topic in hand. The work is invaluable to the sacred scholar, and an honor to American sacred scholarship.

---

* See *ante*, p. 498.

The Church Idea. An Essay toward Unity. By William Reed Huntington, Rector of All Saints, Worcester. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. 248. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1870.

Mr. Huntington is a remarkably graceful, spirited, and liberal writer, free from that effeminate pseudo-piety by which much of the "Church" literature is characterized, alive to the stirring questions of the day, and earnest for the beneficent controlling influence of our common Christianity. His purpose is to show how wisely and beneficially we may all become Episcopalians, and to show Episcopalians upon what outline-scheme of liberal comprehension the one Anglican American Church may beneficently embrace all American Christianity. Dismissing all the incidentals, there are in his view but four essentials to a proper Anglican Church. Among these incidentals he thinks we may first unceremoniously dispense with those accessories which English life has clustered around the English Church: "a tangle of parishes, a wilderness of village spires and cathedral towers, a numerous staff and stately company of deans, prebendaries, and choristers." More valuable, and ever to be retained and diffused where possible, yet not absolutely essential, are the Thirty-nine Articles and the Liturgy. The four essentials which all must embrace, and which may embrace us all, are, The Holy Scriptures as God's word, The Primitive Creeds (the Apostles' and the Nicene) as rule of faith, The two Sacraments, and The Episcopate.

Now it is certain that our Methodist Episcopal Church fully and heartily holds fast all these four essentials. Mr. Huntington will, indeed, courteously inform us that we lack what he considers an *essential* element to a *real* episcopacy, namely, the Apostolic Succession. That issue we are willing to have decided by the words of the founder of the Anglican system, Archbishop Cranmer.

Christianity and Modern Thought. 12mo., pp. 335. New York: James Miller, 647 Broadway. 1872.

"Modern thought," of course, gorgeously figures on the liberal of our Unitarian friends.* We can, indeed, find the equivalents of their "modern thought" plentifully abounding in what have been called "the heretics" of the first and second centuries of Christianity. They sustained about the same relations to the Orthodox Church that these "modern" thinkers sustain to it. A large and highly-refined class styled themselves *Gnostics*, that is, Intellectualists, as being men of minds too large and "liberal" views to be hampered by a narrow "traditional orthodoxy." Still, orthodoxy contrived to adhere to the apostolic teachings and the New Testament records, and, in spite of the liberal depreciations suffered from their intellectual friends, has continued to subsist to the present hour.

---

* See ante, p. 498.

There is a great deal of truly Christian feeling, subtle thought, and elegant diction in the volume. The essays are all excellent in their way, and the fault we find is generally with what is omitted more than with what is said. Two of them, one by Charles Carroll Everett, on "The Relation of Jesus to the Present Age," and the other by Martineau, on "The Place of Mind in Nature and Intuition in Man," are specially excellent. Dr. Hedge's "The Mythical Element in the New Testament" takes the ground that the Gospel narratives, though often false, nevertheless, even in the falsest, present a true underlying "Idea;" while as a whole the character of Jesus, being too transcendent to be fabricated by the evangelists, must be at once a great Idea and a great Fact. That there are any myths in the New Testament we esteem a far worse than gratuitous statement. Mr. Hedge's pseudo-criticism is a thinly-disguised deism. Upon its universal adoption all distinctive Christianity would evaporate into thin air.

◆

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical. With special reference to Ministers and Students. By JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., in connection with a number of European Divines. Translated, enlarged, and edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., assisted by American Scholars of various Evangelical Denominations. Vol. IV of the Old Testament, containing Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

The three Canonical Books, to which this volume of Lange's Bible work is devoted, embrace a most interesting and romantic period of Israelitish history, and one in the study of which the student often feels the need of a thorough and reliable commentary. The present volume is exhaustively full on points where little comment is required, and also on most important passages, but is sometimes noticeably deficient in clearness because of this very fullness. But the volume will compare favorably with those that have gone before it. The commentary on Joshua is by their "modern thought" plentifully abounding in what have been called "the heretics" of the first and second centuries of Christianity. They sustained about the same relation to the Orthodox Church that these "modern" thinkers sustain to it. A large and highly-refined class styled themselves Gnostics, that is, Intellectualists, as being men of minds too large and 'liberal' views to be hampered by a narrow "traditional orthodoxy." Still, orthodoxy contrived to adhere to the apostolic teachings and the New Testament records, and, in spite of the liberal depredations suffered from their intellectual friends, has continued to subsist to the present hour.

There is a great deal of truly Christian feeling, subtle thought, and elegant diction in the volume. The essays are all excellent in their way, and the fault we find is generally with what is omitted more than with what is said. Two of them, one by Charles Carroll Everett, on "The Relation of Jesus to the Present Age," and the other by Martineau, on "The Place of Mind in Nature and Intuition in Man," are specially excellent. Dr. Hedge's "The Mythical Element in the New Testament" takes the ground that the Gospel narratives, though often false, nevertheless, even in the falsest, present a true underlying "Ideal," while as a whole the character of Jesus, being too transcendent to be fabricated by the evangelists, must be at once a great Idea and a great Fact. That there are any myths in the New Testament we esteem a far worse than gratuitous statement. Mr. Hedge's pseudo-criticism is a thinly-disguised deism. Upon its universal adoption all distinctive Christianity would evaporate into thin air.

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical. With special reference to Ministers and Students. By John Peter Lange, D.D., in connection with a number of eminent European divines. Translated, enlarged, and edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., assisted by leading divines of the various evangelical Denominations. Vol. IV of the Old Testament, containing Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

The three Canonical Books, to which this volume of Lange's Bible work is devoted, embrace a most interesting and romantic period of Israelitish history, and one in the study of which the student often feels the need of a thorough and reliable commentary. The present volume is exhaustively full on points where little comment is required, and also on most important passages, but is sometimes noticeably deficient in clearness because of this very fullness. But the volume will compare favorably with those that have gone before it. The commentary on Joshua is by

Rev. F. R. Fay, a son-in-law of Dr. Lange, and the translations and additions are by Dr. G. R. Bliss. It is less satisfactory on the whole than the commentary on Judges and Ruth by Dr. Paulus Cassel, of Berlin, and translated by Professor P. H. Steenstra. Dr. Cassel, a converted Rabbi, is said to be one of the best Talmudic scholars of Germany. He has certainly written a very thorough and valuable work on Joshua and Judges.

We have room only to note that Fay adopts the theory that Joshua's commanding the sun to stand still was no miracle at all, but the whole passage is to be explained as poetry, and not a record of literal facts. Cassel explains Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter as a spiritual offering which he made by devoting her to perpetual virginity.

◆

Lenten Sermons. By Paul Segneri. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 362. New York: The Catholic Publishing House. 1872.

Faithful, searching, eloquent sermons by a man who *meant* the conversion of souls. Segneri flourished in the seventeenth century, was an eminent Jesuit missionary and preacher, and a man of austere piety, and abounding in those self-inflictions of which we find no instance in the New Testament. These sermons exhibit great insight into the human heart, a living sense of the responsibility of both hearer and preacher to God, and a transparency and piercing power of diction. Stripped of incidentals they would be suited not only for the Roman Catholic Church, but for the Catholic Church unlimited by the local *pre-nomen.*

◆

Light on the Pathway of Holiness. By Rev. L. D. M'Cabe, D.D. 16mo., pp. 114 New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. San Francisco: E. Thomas. 1871.

Whether the reader agree with all of Dr. M'Cabe's positions or not, he will not question the clearness of his exposition, the purity of his spirit, or the beauty of his diction. His final solution of the problem he states is his own, and its full acceptance is not necessary in order to an appreciation of his contribution or a spiritual profit from its perusal. We commend it to the study of all who are interested in the prime subject of holy living.

◆

A Comparative History of Religions. By James C. Moffatt, D.D. Part I., Ancient Scriptures. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1871.

Dr. Moffatt's volume is a successful essay toward reducing the materials for comparative theology to a small compass and

attractive form. It is not a Christian polemic argument, yet the whole field is surveyed from a Christian prospect-point. The student in theology will find no better manual than this most interesting department of research. The chapter on Fruits of Recent Scholarship is very valuable.

Christian Theology and Modern Skepticism. By the DUKE OF SOMERSET, K.G. Pp. 182. New York: Appleton & Co. 1872.

This minimum of a book has had the honor of a review by two English Quarterlies and an American republication by the Appletons. It is indebted for such notorieties, not to its rank as an argument or as a product of intellect, which is very humble indeed, but to the social rank of its author. Its object is to show that Christianity is fast disappearing before the power of "modern thought." It succeeds in showing to "modern thought" that a very feeble head may be covered by a ducal coronet.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

How the World was Peopled. Ethnological Lectures by REV. EDWARD FONTAINE. 12mo., pp. 341. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

Mr. Fontaine is a Southern Episcopal clergyman of scientific attainments, who writes not only from an extensive reading upon this subject, but from a wide original observation through the South and West, in a clear style and a candid spirit. His general conclusion is that "there is positively no scientific evidence that any portion of the human race were in existence before the year 4000 or 4004 anterior to the birth of Christ."—P. 72. Yet he reserves the possibility that the deluge was only local, and limited to the destruction of that part of the descendants of Adam dwelling within the proper area of the Hebraic history, thereby leaving the distant races of Africa, the Negroes, and the distant races of Asia like the Chinese, Mongols and Malays, as descendants not of one Noah but of Adam.

Thus we have *five* theories of the flood. The first makes it cover the whole earth, which encounters great difficulties from physical science. The second makes it local, but destroying the entire human race, which encounters difficulties from history and chronology. The third makes it destroy the Messianic-Caucasian race, leaving pre-Adamite races of immense antiquity, and this

seeks to admit the geologic man without contradicting the Scripture text. The fourth postpones the flood, and so the Adamic creation into a geologic antiquity; this breaks the sacred text in order to admit the unity of the race. The fifth is that of Mr. Fontaine, which extends the antiquity of most of the varieties of the human race to the Mosaic Adam, yet preserves their genetic unity.

Mr. Fontaine does not enter extensively into the question of development, evolution, or Darwinism. He approves the dictum of Professor Dana: "'Geology declares unequivocally that the *new forms* (including that of man) were *new expressions*, under the *type idea*, by *created* forms, and not by forms *educed* or *developed* from *one another*,' or from pre-existent forms. They all conclude, and I agree with them, that the parents of the present race of men were *creations* and not *developments*. They were *men originally* by God, and not changed by him from *monkeys into men*." —P. 56.

Mr. Fontaine's main work is to show that all the facts—geological, anatomical, geographical, and ethnographical—are perfectly consistent with the derivation of the race from the Edenic pair. Yet he adduces from the geological phenomena of the lower Mississippi some facts very damaging to the inferences in favor of man's geological antiquity derived by European geologists from the Nile delta, the Abbeville relics, and other alluvial disclosures on the eastern continent. He gives us a map, a picture, and a geological section of the island of Petite Anse. This island consists of river deposits laid in successive strata upon a base of rock salt. Digging down to the base, "cane baskets, stone hatchets, a large stone anvil, and pottery of six different patterns, were thrown out in heaps, with the fossil bones of the elephant and other huge extinct quadrupeds." Yet this entire island is recent, quaternary, and probably within the Mosaic period.

Mr. Fontaine gives a pictured cross-section of a Mississippi alluvium, presenting a stratified thickness of thirty-five feet, and several acres in extent, in which are embedded, at various depths, down to near the bottom, a multitude of objects, such as barrels, boxes, stumps, and other drift, all of which were *deposited in a single year!* The successive layers are of different colors, derived from the different floods of the season, respectively from Red, Kansas, and other rivers. To this he opposes on the opposite page an engraving of the celebrated monument of one of the Pharaohs, whose pedestal is buried nine feet in the alluvium of the river seeks to admit the geologic man without contradicting the Scripture text. The fourth postpones the flood, and so the Adamic creation into a geologic antiquity; this breaks the sacred text in order to admit the unity of the race. The fifth is that of Mr. Fontaine, which extends the antiquity of most of the varieties of the human race to the Mosaic Adam, yet preserves their genetic unity.

Mr. Fontaine does not enter extensively into the question of development, evolution, or Darwinism. He approves the dictum of Professor Dana: "'Geology declares unequivocally that the new *forms* (including that of man) were *new creations*, under the *type idea*, by *created forms*, and not by forms *educed* or *developed from one another*,' or from pre-existent forms. They all concur, and I agree with them, that the parents of the present race of men were creations and not *developments*. They were made directly by God, and not changed by him from monkeys into men." —P. 56.

Mr. Fontaine's main work is to show that all the facts—geological, anatomical, geographical, and ethnographical—are perfectly consistent with the derivation of the race from the Edenic pair. Yet he adduces from the geological phenomena of the lower Mississippi some facts very damaging to the inferences in favor of man's geological antiquity derived by European geologists from the Nile delta, the Abbeville relics, and other alluvial disclosures on the eastern continent. He gives us a map, a picture, and a geological section of the island of Petite Anse. This island consists of river deposits laid in successive strata upon a base of rock salt. Digging down to the base, "cane baskets, stone hatchets, a large stone anvil, and pottery of six different patterns, were thrown out in heaps, with the fossil bones of the elephant and other huge extinct quadrupeds." Yet this entire island is recent, quaternary, and probably within the Mosaic period.

Mr. Fontaine gives a pictured cross-section of a Mississippi alluvium, presenting a stratified thickness of thirty-five feet, and several acres in extent, in which are embedded, at various depths, down to near the bottom, a multitude of objects, such as 'boards, logs, stumps, and other drift, all of which were deposited in a single year.' The successive layers are of different colors, derived from the different floods of the season, respectively from Red, Arkansas, and other rivers. To this he opposes on the opposite page an engraving of the celebrated monument of one of the Pharaohs, whose pedestal is buried nine feet in the alluvium of the river

Nile, and from which geologists have inferred a stupendous antiquity for certain pottery buried at a lower depth, and so of the human race. One picture explains the other. The variously colored strata of the Nile, which have been supposed to represent each a year, like those of the Mississippi, are derived from various rivers, namely, Tacassé, Blue Nile, Bahar el Abiad and other affluents, and reveal nothing of the age of the entire mass of deposits. The whole may have been deposited in a single year. And this at once demolishes all certainty in the attempts to prove an immense antiquity from alluvial strata. Hence he infers that "the discoveries of Messrs. Perthes, Regollot, and Prestwich 'in ancient alluvium,' at Abbeville and Amiens, prove that an aboriginal race who were *Celts*, or who preceded them, were hunters, and used implements of stone like our North American Indians; but they determine nothing in regard to the precise period when they flourished. They may have been the contemporaries of Abraham and Lot, and they were probably coeval with the builders of the 'kitchen middens' on the coasts of the Danish islands of the Baltic, and of the pile habitations of the primeval occupants of the shores of Lake Zurich in Switzerland."—Page 66.

The Swiss of the Stone Age, he says, "certainly lived before the conquest of the Helvetii, a half century prior to the Christian era, and they may possibly have been contemporary with the Pœonians of Lake Prasias mentioned by Herodotus, who, about five hundred and twenty years before the Saviour's advent, lived, he tells us, in houses which were built on a platform of wooden stakes, while a narrow bridge, which could be withdrawn at pleasure, communicated with the shore."—Page 69.

These facts seem to make havoc with Sir Charles Lyell and his brother theorists. Science, both natural and biblical, is obliged to Mr. Fontaine for spreading them before the public.

◆

Ancient America in Notes on American Archæology. By JOHN D. BALDWIN. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 299. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Mr. Baldwin's name is already familiar with our readers from our notice of his "Pre-Historic Nations," a work in which he has boldly attempted to roll human and civilized history back far into an antiquity that seems to identify the historic with the geologic man. What he did in that volume for the eastern hemisphere he now does still more abundantly for our western. As science has pronounced ours to be geologically the oldest hemi-

sphere, so, he maintains, ours is the oldest humanity and the oldest civilization. His views are invested with something of the interest as well as the credibility of romance; and it is but just to repeat our former remark, that though Mr. Baldwin's researches appear to invalidate the eldest pages of sacred writ, he shows no irreverent spirit.

Who were the "mound-builders?" Spread over a vast area of our country, from south of our lake-chain to the farthest branches of the Missouri, is an immense number of earth-works, constructed with some geometric skill, sometimes as solid masses and sometimes in long lines, as earth-ridges, inclosing acres and miles in their compass. Our present aborigines are as ignorant of their origin as they are themselves incapable of their construction. As we travel southward they grow more architectural and numerous, until they seem finally to emerge in the stately structures of South America, whose grandeur amazes our modern eye, but whose history and origin are lost in an obscure antiquity. And this is a rich problem for Mr. Baldwin, who rejoices in piling ages on ages in the rear-ground of our race.

Our thanks are due to him for thus laying before the public a mass of highly interesting facts, collected from a variety of recondite sources and various languages, in a clear style, with a large number of graphic and authentic illustrations, and in compact manual form. Of this our northern section of America there is no antiquity which is not either a bleak blank or a bleaker record. We go to South America for antiquities; and these, though amazing to the eye and surprising us by their novelty, stand so isolated from all that interests us in history that they have won few explorers and little public attention.

We do not think that Mr. Baldwin has shown, and regret his attempt to show, either the autochthonic or ante-Mosaic origin of the great architects of South America. Say they are two thousand years old; that brings them little earlier than Julius Cæsar. Give them three thousand years, and they are about contemporary with King David. A fourth thousand makes them a trifle earlier than Abraham. Let them be, as Dr. M'Causland would make them, great grandsons, or descendants within five hundred years, of the Hamite builders of Babel, who, possessing the Phenician genius for navigation inherited from Noah, crossed the eastern sea and, under the name of Toltecs, developed, in a language retained from Shinar, a Hamitic civilization. We cannot prove this theory, but Mr. Baldwin cannot disprove it; it meets sphere, so, he maintains, ours is the oldest humanity and the oldest civilization. His views are invested with something of the interest as well as the credibility of romance; and it is but just to repeat our former remark, that though Mr. Baldwin's researches appear to invalidate the eldest pages of sacred writ, he shows no irreverent spirit.

Who were the "mound-builders?" Spread over a vast area of our country, from south of our lake chain to the farthest branches of the Missouri, is an immense number of earth-works, constructed with some geometric skill, sometimes as solid masses and sometimes in long lines, as earth-ridges, inclosing acres and miles in their compass. Our present aborigines are as ignorant of their origin as they are themselves incapable of their construction. As we travel southward they grow more architectural and numerous, until they seem finally to emerge in the stately structures of South America, whose grandeur amazes our modern eye, but whose history and origin are lost in an obscure antiquity. And this is a rich problem for Mr. Baldwin, who rejoices in piling ages on ages in the rear-ground of our race.

Our thanks are due to him for thus laying before the public a mass of highly interesting facts, collected from a variety of recondite sources and various languages, in a clear style, with a large number of graphic and authentic illustrations, and in compact manual form. Of this our northern section of America there is no antiquity which is not either a blank blank or a bleaker record. We go to South America for antiquities; and these, though amazing to the eye and surprising us by their novelty, stand so isolated from all that interests us in history that they have won few explorers and little public attention.

We do not think that Mr. Baldwin has shown, and regard his attempt to show, either the autochthonic or ante-Noachic origin of the great architects of South America. Say they are two thousand years old; that brings them little earlier than Julius Cæsar. Give them three thousand years, and they are about contemporary with King David. A fourth thousand makes them a trifle earlier than Abraham. Let them be, as Dr. M'Causland would make them, great grandsons, or descendants within six hundred years, of the Hamite builders of Babel, who, possessing the Phenician genius for navigation inherited from Noah, crossed the eastern sea and, under the name of Toltecs, developed, in a language retained from Shinar, a Hamitic civilization. We cannot prove this theory, but Mr. Baldwin cannot disprove it; it is most all the points of the problem, and has the following plausibilities in its favor.

We quote from M'Causland's Builders of Babel:

"The rulers of Mexico at the time of the Spanish conquest were the Aztecs, whose empire was built on the ruins of a more ancient people called the Toltecs. The origin of this latter race is hid in the mazes of mythology; but the tradition was that their ancestors had migrated from 'the distant East, beyond immense seas and lands.' They were designated by Humboldt as the Pelasgi of the Western hemisphere, or the oldest known race in the land; and Prescott states that their tribal appellation had passed into a synonym for '*architect*' from the noble ruins of religious and other edifices still to be seen in various parts of new Spain, and which are referred to them. The early forefathers of this people were no doubt the builders of the more ancient temples and tumuli in Central America, which present so remarkable a resemblance to the architectural remains of Mesopotamia and Egypt that antiquarians have not hesitated to ascribe to them all a common origin. The terraced and truncated pyramid of Cholula in Mexico, Prescott informs us, was built after the model of The Temple of Belus, as described by Herodotus."—P. 89. The great pyramid situated in Xochicalcho is stated to be scarcely distinguishable from the ordinary type of those in lower Egypt. —P. 91. "Again, in the ruined cities of Cambodia, which lies farther to the east of Burmah, recent research has discovered *teocallis* like those in Mexico, and the remains of temples of the same type and pattern as those of Yucatan. And when we reach the sea, we encounter at Suku, in Java, a *teocalli* absolutely identical with that of Tehuantepec. With such evidences, Mr. Ferguson is well warranted in his observations, 'That as we advance eastward from the valley of the Euphrates, at every step we meet with forms of art becoming more and more like those of Central America.' But for the geographical difficulty, the same author considers that no one could hesitate to admit that the architecture of Central America was borrowed from the old world."—P. 99.

Upon this subject Mr. Fontaine is copious, and furnishes a timely antidote to Mr. Baldwin's antiquarian reveries.

But in Peru traces of geological humanity are found! (P. 273.) On the shores of Lake Titicaca are "ruins that *may be* as venerable as the lake-dwellers of Geneva," "*perhaps* coeval with the flint-flakes of Cornwall and the shell-mounds of Denmark."

"May be" and "perhaps" as old as something whose age you know nothing about! Flint-flakes and shell-mounds are fast becoming unendurable bores. Mr. Baldwin brings such wares to a falling market. The Peruvians were undoubtedly Malays, and we wait for proof that the Malays are older than Adam. Mr. Fontaine says, "If a congregation of twelve representatives from Malacca, China, Japan, Mongolia, and the unmixed natives of the Sandwich Islands, the pure-blooded Chilian, Peruvian, and Brazilian Indians, and others selected from the unmixed Chickasaws, Comanches, or any other North American tribes, were all assembled and dressed in the same costume, I doubt whether the most skillful painter or the most practiced anatomist, judging from their appearance only, could separate them into their respective nationalities."—P. 147.

The Builders of Babel. By Dominick M'Causland, Q.C., LL.D., Author of "Adam and the Adamite." 12mo., pp. 339. London: Richard Bentley and Sons. 1871.

In noticing Dr. M'Causland's previous volume, "Adam and the Adamite," in which he maintained with great learning and plausibility the theory that Genesis is strictly the history of the Adamic-Messianic race, identical with the Caucasian, brought into existence at the Edenic center, the last of many creations of the one human species, we expressed the opinion that if science compelled the concession of the immense antiquity of man, his theory was preferable to any other view, inasmuch as, unlike all others, it only required a different interpretation of certain texts, but no violation of the text itself. The Duke of Argyle's theory, which postpones Adam millions of years back, destroys the Messianic genealogy. Since our expressing this view, however, the argument for man's geological antiquity has weakened rather than strengthened. So far as we have observed, no new evidence for such antiquity is adduced; very damaging refutations have appeared of nearly every old argument; although, meanwhile, the *savants* are still talking with undiminished confidence, grounding themselves on the stock instances heretofore produced.

Dr. M'Causland's previous publication stated his theory, professedly showed its accordance with Scripture, and based it on science and history. The present volume traces the Edenic, Adamic, Messianic, or Caucasian race, as it divides at Shinar into its great threefold branches, the Hamitic, the Shemitic, and the Japhetic. The work is, thence, a free, full, rich, and lucid commentary on the prophecy of Noah. The spirit is devout, and

"May be" and "perhaps" as old as something whose age we know nothing about! Flint flakes and shell-mounds are fast becoming considerable bores. Mr. Baldwin brings such wares to a falling market. The Peruvians were undoubtedly Malays, but we wait for proof that the Malays are older than Adam. Mr. Fontaine says, "If a congregation of twelve representatives from Malacca, China, Japan, Mongolia, and the untraced natives of the Sandwich Islands, the pure-blooded Chilian, Peruvian, and Brazilian Indians, and others selected from the unmixed Cherokees, Comanches, or any other North American tribes, were all assembled and dressed in the same costume, I doubt whether the most skillful painter or the most practiced anatomist, judging from their appearance only, could separate them into their respective nationalities."—P. 147.

The Builders of Babel. By Dominick M'Causland, Q.C., LL.D. Author of "Adam and the Adamite." 12mo, pp. 328. London: Richard Bentley and Son. 1871.

In noticing Dr. M'Causland's previous volume, "Adam and the Adamite," in which he maintained with great learning and plausibility the theory that Genesis is strictly the history of the Adamic-Messianic race, identical with the Caucasian, brought into existence at the Edenic centre, the last of many creations of the one human species, we expressed the opinion that if science compelled the concession of the immense antiquity of man, his theory was preferable to any other view, inasmuch as, unlike all others, it only required a different interpretation of certain texts, but no violation of the text itself. The Duke of Argyle's theory, which postpones Adam millions of years back, destroys the Messianic genealogy. Since our expressing this view, however, the argument for man's geological antiquity has weakened rather than strengthened. So far as we have observed, no new evidence for such antiquity is adduced; very damaging refutations have appeared of nearly every old argument; although, meanwhile, the savants are still talking with undiminished confidence, grounding themselves on the stock instances heretofore produced.

Dr. M'Causland's previous publication stated his theory, professedly showed its accordance with Scripture, and based it in science and history. The present volume traces the Edenic, Adamic, Messianic, or Caucasian race, as it divides at Babel into its great threefold branches, the Hamitic, the Shemitic, and the Japhetic. The work is, thence, a free, full, rich, and lucid commentary on the prophecy of Noah. The spirit is devout, and the style is flowing and eloquent. In that great primeval prediction the author reads the outline of all history, for it is this race alone that has not only written all history, but which has *made* all history.

Earliest and briefest in its development and guilty grandeur was the race of Ham. This race started up in Nimrod, was profane leader at Babel, was monarch of the world in Chaldea, was the merchant and navigator over the globe in the Phenicians, and persistently carried out its primitive architectural ambition in the pyramids of the Nile, in the rock-cut temples of India, and, crossing the ocean, in the stupendous structures of South America. But its glory was as evanescent as it was godless and cruel. The monuments of its pride and power are standing, but the race itself has perished.

While Ham was thus the *architect* of the world—finding his highest power and ambition exhausted in shaping immense masses of external material in slightly mathematical exactness—and while Japhet is the *philosopher* of the world, Shem is its *prophet.* Shem has furnished all our religious truth; in his records are contained all the authentic and systematic prophecy, and from his loins came the world's Redeemer. But it was reserved for Japhet's enlargement to take and ennoble all that Ham and Shem inherited. As philosopher he surpasses Ham in all external science and material art, and he carries Shem's religion to its highest and purest development. The world, civilized and regenerated, belongs to the future of Japhet.

Mr. Fontaine, indeed, claims, in his book above reviewed, that a belief in the genetic unity of the race is most favorable to a brotherly feeling toward all the varieties of man. But we fear that in his pages he amply forfeits the benefit of that claim. This amiable Southerner maintains that the negro race is perishing the world over, (pp. 170-184;) that the yellow races are diminishing, (p. 175;) that our Indian races are vanishing still more rapidly, (p. 236;) that an inferior race always vanishes before contact with a superior, (p. 174;) and that the crowning ultimate of our world's history will be attained by the passing away of "the inferior and unimprovable races of men," (p. 230.) What is gained, then, by their descent from Adam? Dr. M'Causland would find the blessed unity of man in Christ rather than in Adam. "As *in* Adam all die, even so *in* Christ shall all be made alive." Of the two prepositions in this text, inasmuch as the latter does not require a genetic *in*ness, so the style is flowing and eloquent. *In this great primeval prediction* the author reads the outline of all history, for it is this race alone that has not only written all history, but which has made all history.

Earliest and briefest in its development and earthy greatness was the race of Ham. This race started up in Nimrod, was profane leader at Babel, was monarch of the world in Chaldea, was the merchant and navigator over the globe in the Phenicians, and persistently carried out its primitive architectural ambition in the pyramids of the Nile, in the rock-cut temples of India, and, crossing the ocean, in the stupendous structures of South America. But its glory was as evanescent as it was godless and cruel. The monuments of its pride and power are standing, but the race itself has perished.

While *Ham* was thus the *architect* of the world—finding his highest power and ambition exhausted in shaping immense masses of external material in slightly mathematical exactness—and while *Japhet* is the *philosopher* of the world, *Shem* is its *prophet*. Shem has furnished all our religious truth; in his records are contained all the authentic and systematic prophecy, and from his loins came the world's Redeemer. But it was reserved for *Japhet's enlargement* to take and combine all that Ham and Shem inherited. As philosopher he surpasses Ham in all external science and material art, and he carries Shem's religion to its highest and purest development. The world, civilized and regenerated, belongs to the future of *Japhet*.

Mr. Fontaine, indeed, claims, in his book above reviewed, that a belief in the generic unity of the race is most favorable to a brotherly feeling toward all the varieties of men. But we fear that in his pages he amply furnishes the balance of that claim. This amiable gentleman maintains that the negro race is perishing the world over, (pp. 170-184;) that the yellow races are diminishing, (p. 175;) that our Indian races are vanishing still more rapidly, (p. 286;) that an inferior race always vanishes before contact with a superior, (p. 174;) and that the crowning ultimate of our world's history will be attained by the passing away of "the inferior and unimprovable races of men," (p. 286.) What is gained, then, by their descent from *Adam*? Dr. M'Causland would find the blessed unity of man in *Christ* rather than in *Adam*. "*As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" Of the two propositions in this text, inasmuch as the latter does not require a genetic oneness, so need not the former; and it is rather in the latter *in* of the text, not in the former, that the blessed unity of our humanity may consist. We are not *in* Christ by descending from Christ, but by a mystical union with Christ. Descent from a single pair may not be necessary to oneness of nature, oneness of rights, and oneness of destiny. The most unflinching advocates of slavery have admitted the oneness of descent, and have defended the system on the grounds of inferiority of some of the branches of the one family tree.

Both Dr. M'Causland's volumes will richly repay perusal. Especially should those who attempt to refute him have a correct knowledge of what they are attacking.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Incidents and Anecdotes of Rev. Edward T. Taylor, for over Forty Years Pastor of the Seamen's Bethel, Boston. By Rev. GILBERT HAVEN, Editor of "Zion's Herald," and Hon. THOMAS RUSSELL, Collector of the Port of Boston. 12mo. Boston: B. B. Russell. 1872.

Doubtless it will be a book that is a book, of which Father Taylor is the subject and Gilbert Haven the writer. As by the wand of old Cornelius Agrippa, the dead is made to live again. And such a dead! We see with our memory's eye, at every page, the figure and face of the Seaman's Preacher; we hear his voice, and mark his gesture, as he utters those quaint, wise, and startling things, compelling now, as formerly, laughter and tears in a highly promiscuous and disorderly way, until we fling away the pestilential book and return to ourself and our own decorum. In fact, the concentration of a whole life's piquancies into a few hours, in spite of the truthfulness of the portraiture, places the book beyond the man. Mother Taylor's true apothegm regarding him, "When he dives he sometimes brings up pearls and sometimes mud," is obviated; for though the fact of the mud is no way concealed, yet it is with the pearls alone that the reader is treated. That the pearls were of rich brilliancy, and often flung about with a harum-scarum profusion, is evident from the fact that so many people of severest taste, both of Boston and elsewhere, testify their rich appreciation of his affluence. It was no wonder that Summerfield captivated the taste and literature of his day, for the exquisite beauty of his eloquence charmed and subdued the highest criticism by presenting it the realization of its own ideal. But Taylor, with all the drawback of a defiance of all rules, conquered in spite of the alloy by the amazing resplendence of the true sparkle. The vivid

descriptions of the live preacher by Harriet Martineau, Miss Bremer, Charles Dickens, John Ross Dix, Freeman Clarke, and Dr. Bellows, are themselves gems of beauty.

The honorable record of the Unitarians of Boston, their benevo.lence of pocket and liberality of soul in aiding the Bethel enterprise in its struggles, and, snapping the red-tape of an over-fastidious refinement, in appreciating the pearls mauger the mud, is unreservedly accorded by the biographer. This fact no doubt largely explained Taylor's religious comprehension, enabling him to see that the "spirit of faith" might often lie concealed in hearts not breast-plated with the forms of faith. This, nevertheless, never led him to undervalue the importance of doctrinal truth, nor make his own theology any the less Methodistic in its type. When the Aristocracies of intellect or wealth visited his chapel, they always found that Jack Tar had precedence in occupying the main body of the church, and, when the jam required, filled the chancel, the pulpit stairs, or the preacher's cushion, while their own pride must be content with the side seats. Now and then he opened fire upon them, assuring his marines that this shot was not meant for them, wicked as they were, but for the sinners at the starboard and larboard. Scholar, preacher, or layman may find in this volume large wisdom for both head and heart.

Freeman Clarke remarked: "He was a genuine Methodist, and no one wished him to be any thing else." As a Methodist, with all his expansiveness—and none need be any the less truly expansive for being a Methodist—we may be sure that Mr. Haven frankly and unshrinkingly describes him. The headings of the chapters announce this in fearless "small-cap:" Father Taylor "In the Bethel," "In the Bethel Prayer-Meeting," "In Conference," "In Camp-Meeting," "In the Preachers' Meeting," etc. The evolutions of the character of the unique subject, in all its various fields and phases, are exhibited with a truthful analysis and a master's pencil. Our American Methodism is not poor in biography. It is rich and will be richer in a great variety of character. Men of statesmanlike capacity, like Asbury and Hedding; men of rare eloquence, like Summerfield and Bascom; men of rich accomplishments, like Fisk and M'Clintock, have lived memorable lives commemorated by competent hands. But no biography, in our whole catalogue of England or America, after Wesley and Fletcher, is more abounding in matter to touch both intellect and heart than Father Taylor portrayed by Gilbert Haven.

descriptions of the live preacher by Harriet Martineau, Miss Bremer, Charles Dickens, John Ross Dix, Freeman Clarke, and Dr. Bellows, are themselves gems of beauty.

The honorable record of the Cultivated Boston, their benevolence of pocket and liberality of soul in aiding the Bethel enterprise in its struggles, and, escaping the verdicts of an over-fastidious refinement, in appreciating the people's preacher the meed, is deservedly accorded by the biographer. This fact no doubt largely explained Taylor's religious comprehensiveness, enabling him to see that the "spirit of faith" might often be connected in hearts not breast-plated with the forms of faith. This, nevertheless, never led him to undervalue the importance of doctrinal truth, nor make his own theology any the less Methodistic in its type. When the Aristocracies of intellect or wealth visited his chapel, they always found that Jack Tar had precedence in occupying the main body of the church, and, when the jam required, filled the chancel, the pulpit stairs, or the preacher's cushion, while their dignitaries must be content with the side seats. Now and then he opened fire upon them, assuring his marines that this shot was not meant for them, wicked as they were, but for the sinners at the starboard and larboard. Scholar, preacher, or layman may find in this volume large wisdom for both head and heart.

Freeman Clarke remarked: "He was a genuine Methodist, and no one wished him to be any thing else." As a Methodist, with all his expansiveness—and none need be any the less truly expansive for being a Methodist—we may be sure that Mr. Haven frankly and unshrinkingly describes him. The headings of the chapters announce this in [illegible] "[illegible]:" "Father Taylor "In the Bethel," "In the Bethel Prayer-Meeting," "In Conference," "In Camp-Meeting," "In the Preachers' Meeting," etc. The evolutions of the character of the unique subject, in all its various fields and phases, are exhibited with a truthful analysis and a master's pencil. Our American Methodism is not poor in Biography. It is rich and will be richer in a great variety of greatness. Men of statesmanlike capacity, like Asbury and Hedding; men of rare eloquence, like Summerfield and Bascom; men of rich accomplishments, like Fisk and M'Clintock, have lived memorable lives commemorated by competent hands. But no biography, in our whole catalogue of England or America, after Wesley and Fletcher, is more absorbing in matter to touch both intellect and heart than Father Taylor portrayed by Gilbert Haven.

New York and Its Institutions. 1609–1871. A Library of Information Pertaining to the Great Metropolis, Past and Present, with Historic Sketches of its Churches, Schools, Public Buildings, Parks, Cemeteries; of its Police, Fire, Health, and Quarantine Departments; of its Prisons, Hospitals, Homes, Asylums, Dispensaries, and Morgue; and all Municipal and Private Charitable Institutions. By Rev. J. RICHMOND, (Five Years City Missionary in New York.) Illustrated with upward of Two Hundred Engravings. 12mo., pp. 608. New York: E. B. Treat. 1871.

Mr. Richmond is a member of the New York Conference, and in his character as city missionary for several years has formed a decidedly intimate acquaintance with our great metropolis. He has consequently furnished a book which every thinking New Yorker needs, and especially a guide-book for the visitor who purposes to learn New York. His illustrations are numerous, and, with the exception of those that are apparently designed to represent human faces, illustrative. It strangely contains not a single map. It opens with an interesting sketch of New York history, and then ranges through the various institutions so copiously enumerated in the title-page. We know no work that rivals it in the department it occupies, and it ought to be a paying investment to both the very competent author and the enterprising publisher.

But what is "New York?" Mr. Richmond truly says, "It stands on the little island called by the Indians Manhattan; but Brooklyn, Williamsburgh, Greenpoint, Jersey City, Hoboken, and Tarrytown are but its suburbs, containing the residences of its laborers, clerks, and merchant princes." But quite as truly the large and splendid cities of Newark and Elizabeth, with their extensive and beautiful suburbs, are suburban to New York. We may in fact say that with these two cities there are several other New Jersey lesser cities contiguous, whose interspaces are so fast filling up as to need but ten years more of growth like that of the last ten years to form one great "City of New Jersey," yet truly part of the Great Metropolis.

Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland: Delivered in Edinburgh in 1872. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. 12mo., pp. 207. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

These lectures are characterized by the liberality and eloquence of all Stanley's performances. They abound in graphic history, life-like protraitures, and choice anecdote. The whole work is full of fascination.

New York and its Institutions. 1609–1871. A Library of Information Pertaining to the Great Metropolis, Past and Present, with Historic Sketches of its Churches, Schools, Public Buildings, Public Celebrations, of its Police, Fire, Health, and Quarantine Departments, of its Prisons, Hospitals, [illegible], Dispensaries, and Morgues; and of Benevolent and Private Charitable Institutions. By Rev. J. Richmond, (New York City Missionary in New York.) Illustrated with upward of Two Hundred Engravings. 12mo., pp. 608. New York: E. B. Treat. 1871.

Mr. Richmond is a member of the New York Conference, and in his character as city missionary for several years has formed a decidedly intimate acquaintance with our great metropolis. He has consequently furnished a book which every thinking New Yorker needs, and especially a guide-book for the visitor who purposes to learn New York. Its illustrations are numerous, and, with the exception of those that are apparently designed to represent human faces, illustrative. It strangely contains not a single map. It opens with an interesting sketch of New York history, and then ranges through the various institutions so copiously enumerated in the title page. We know no work that rivals it in the department it occupies, and it ought to be a paying investment to both the very competent author and the enterprising publisher.

But what is "New York?" Mr. Richmond truly says, "It stands on the little island called by the Indians Manhattan; but Brooklyn, Williamsburgh, Greenpoint, Jersey City, Hoboken and Tarrytown are but its suburbs, containing the residences of its laborers, clerks, and merchant princes." But quite as truly the large and splendid cities of Newark and Elizabeth, with their extensive and beautiful suburbs, are suburban to New York. We may in fact say that with these two cities there are several other New Jersey lesser cities contiguous, whose interspaces are so rapidly filling up as to need but ten years more of growth like that of the last ten years to form one great "City of New Jersey," truly part of the Great Metropolis.

Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland: Delivered in Edinburgh in 1872. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. 12mo., pp. 207. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

These lectures are characterized by the liberality and vivacity of all Stanley's performances. They abound in graphic history, life-like portraitures, and choice anecdotes. The whole work is full of fascination.

Literature and Fiction.

First Lessons in Composition. By JOHN S. HART, LL.D., Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. 12mo., pp. 144. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1872.

A Manual of Composition and Rhetoric: A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By JOHN S. HART, LL.D. Fourth Edition. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co.

A Manual of English Literature: A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By JOHN S. HART, LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and of the English Language and Literature in the College of New Jersey. 12mo., pp. 636. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1872.

Dr. Hart has attained a high reputation in the educational world, which is amply justified by the series of works designed to induct the scholar in the mastery of English style and literature. Our impression is that there is a great neglect of a due early training in the proper and effective handling of our mother tongue.

The first of the above series furnishes abundant training in the manipulation of sentences, enabling the pupil to twist and transpose his vernacular into all its admissible forms, until it becomes lithe and effective in his hands.

The second contains a full treatise on punctuation, a statement of the higher principles of style, an analysis of the laws of versification, and rules and guidances to the more elevated grades of composition.

The third is an historical survey of English Literature from its earliest period to the present day. The chronology by centuries is discarded. In its stead is substituted the selection in the successive periods of some one great writer as the center, and around him are clustered a large subordinate number. Thus the natural periods of development and expansion are necessarily presented as the true epochs of the chronology. The grand landmarks, for instance, are Chaucer, Spenser, Shakspeare, Bacon, each as the center of his own constellation of lesser stars. A brief biography and a characterization of each are given. This finishes a complete induction, by a route original and effective, into the mysteries of our native speech and its literature. It is such a process as every scholar ought to thread. The volumes are furnished with handsome typography and externals.

Miscellaneous.

Threescore Years and Beyond; or, Experiences of the Aged. A Book for Old People. Describing the Labors, Habits, Home-Life, and Closing Experiences of a Large Number of Aged Representative Men and Women of the Earlier and Later Times. Illustrated Edition. By Rev. W. H. DE PUY, D.D. Large 8vo., pp. 512. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

Dr. De Puy, though in prime young manhood, here seats himself in the didactic chair to teach his venerable seniors that it

Literature and Fiction.

First Lessons in Composition. By John S. Hart, LL.D., Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. 12mo., pp. 136. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1872.

A Manual of Composition and Rhetoric: A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By John S. Hart, LL.D. Fourth Edition. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co.

A Manual of English Literature: A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges. By John S. Hart, LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and of the English Language and Literature in the College of New Jersey. 12mo., pp. 360. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1872.

Dr. Hart has attained a high reputation in the educational world, which is amply justified by the series of works designed to initiate the scholar in the mastery of English style and literature. Our impression is that there is a great neglect of a due early training in the proper and effective handling of our mother tongue.

The first of the above series furnishes abundant training in the manipulation of sentences, enabling the pupil to twist and transpose his vernacular into all its admissible forms, until it becomes lithe and effective in his hands.

The second contains a full treatise on punctuation, a statement of the higher principles of style, an analysis of the laws of versification, and rules and guidances to the more elevated grades of composition.

The third is an historical survey of English Literature from its earliest period to the present day. The chronology by centuries is discarded. In its stead is substituted the selection in the successive periods of some one great writer as the center, and around him are clustered a large subordinate number. Thus the natural periods of development and expansion are necessarily presented as the true epochs of the chronology. The grand landmarks, for instance, are Chaucer, Spenser, Shakspeare, Milton, each as the center of his own constellation of lesser stars. A brief biography and a characterization of each are given. This finishes a complete induction, by a route original and effective, into the mysteries of our native speech and its literature. It is such a process as every scholar ought to thread. The volumes are furnished with handsome typography and externals.

Miscellaneous.

Threescore Years and Beyond; or, Experiences of the Aged. A Book for Old People. Describing the Labors, Home Life, and Closing Experiences of a Large Number of Aged Representative Men and Women of the Former and Later Times. Illustrated Edition. By Rev. W. H. De Puy, D.D. Large 8vo., pp. 512. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

Dr. De Puy, though in prime young manhood, here seats himself in the didactic chair to teach his venerable seniors that it may be quite unnecessary for them to be *old* at any age. It would be, however, perhaps fairer to say that he does not do the teaching himself, but makes the old teach the old; that is, he calls upon the aged of the past to reveal to the aged of the present the secret of unceasing youth, or something better than youth. It is, therefore, a cheering and beneficial book for those upon whom the irrevocable shadows of multiplying years are gathering solemnity and sadness. When we had accomplished our fortieth year we utterly gave ourself over for an old man, and took to reading Cicero's De Senectute. The Roman orator and philosopher had got ahead of Dr. De Puy very much in the same line. He brought up numerous examples of fine old heathen saints who taught us what beautiful hues may suffuse the afternoon sky of life. This made us a better Christian, and so a happier man. Yet the cheer and the lesson of this book may often be unwisely appropriated. Often it is a painful fact that "superfluous lags the veteran on the stage," until he has to be hustled off by stalwart shoulders. The venerable Dr. Todd, of Pittsfield, made this bargain with his Church: You shall tell me if my mind fails, and I will tell you if it is my body. It was the Doctor, as it proved, that had to do the telling. Dr. De Puy might have quoted some illustrious octogenarians by whom the world is ruled at the present hour: Von Moltke, conqueror of France; Thiers, President of France, whose sole personality is the keystone of French safety; Vanderbilt, our railway emperor; and Bryant, still a poet and a statesman. There are thousands who have made the transit over the Rubicon of sixty to whom Dr. De Puy's bouquet of evergreens will be an acceptable gift.

◆

The Book of Kings. By KARL CHR. W. T. BAHR, D.D. Part I. Translated, Enlarged, and Edited by EDWIN HARWOOD, D.D. Book II. By W. G. SUMNER, B.A. 12mo., pp. 312. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co., 654 Broadway. 1872.

Laicus; or, the Experiences of a Layman in a Country Parish. By LYMAN ABBOTT. 12mo., pp. 358. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.

◆

Notices of the following books are postponed to the next number:

Lamon's Life of Abraham Lincoln—Osgood & Co.
Day's Æsthetics—C. C. Chatfield & Co.
Dr. Wythe's Science and Revelation—Lippincott & Co.
Dr. Alfred Brunson's Memoirs. Vol. I—Hitchcock & Walden.
Lord Ormathwaite's Astronomy and Geology Compared—Appleton & Co.
Huxley's Criticisms on Darwin and Administrative Nihilism—Appleton & Co.
Figuier's World Before the Deluge—Appleton & Co.

may be quite unnecessary for them to be old at any age. It would be, however, perhaps fairer to say that he does not do the teaching himself, but makes the old teach the old; that is, he calls upon the aged of the past to reveal to the aged of the present the secret of unceasing youth, or something better than youth. It is, therefore, a cheering and beneficial book for those upon whom the irrevocable shadows of multiplying years are gathering solemnity and sadness. When we had accomplished our fortieth year we utterly gave ourself over for an old man, and took to reading Cicero's De Senectute. The Roman orator and philosopher had got ahead of Dr. De Fuy very much in the same line. He brought up numerous examples of fine old heathen saints who taught us what beautiful hues may suffuse the afternoon sky of life. This made us a better Christian, and so a happier man. Yet the cheer and the lesson of this book may often be unwisely appropriated. Often it is a painful fact that "superfluous lags the veteran on the stage," until he has to be hustled off by stalwart shoulders. The venerable Dr. Todd, of Pittsfield, made this bargain with his Church: You shall tell me if my mind fails, and I will tell you if it is my body. It was the Doctor, as it proved, that had to do the telling. Dr. De Fuy might have quoted some illustrious octogenarians by whom the world is ruled at the present hour: Von Moltke, conqueror of France; Thiers, President of France, whose sole personality is the keystone of French safety; Vanderbilt, our railway emperor; and Bryant, still a poet and a statesman. There are thousands who have made the transit over the Rubicon of sixty to whom Dr. De Fuy's bouquet of evergreens will be an acceptable gift.

The Book of Kings. By [illegible] W. T. [illegible], D.D. Part I. Translated, Arranged, and Edited by Edwin [illegible], D.D. Book II. By W. G. [illegible], B.A. 12mo., pp. 412. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. and [illegible]. 1872.

[illegible]; or, the Experiences of a Layman in a Country Parish. By [illegible]. 12mo., pp. 355. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1873.

Notices of the following books are postponed to the next number:

Lamon's Life of Abraham Lincoln—Osgood & Co.
Day's Elements—G. C. Chatfield & Co.
Dr. *Wythe's Science and Revelation*—Lippincott & Co.
Dr. *Alfred Brunson's Memoirs.* Vol. I.—Hitchcock & Walden.
Lord [illegible]'s Autobiography and [illegible] Correspondence—Appleton & Co.
Huxley's Criticisms on Darwin and Administrative Nihilism—Appleton & Co.
Figuier's World Before the Deluge—Appleton & Co.

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1872.

ART. I.—PRESSENSÉ'S "MARTYRS AND APOLOGISTS."

THE story of the first three centuries of the Christian era will ever continue to be the most important and most interesting chapter in the history of the race. It was a grand transition period. Old things were passing away, and all things were becoming new. Paganism, like a rotten tree, was hollow at the heart and tottering to its fall. The world, weary with waiting for the healer of its woes, hailed with joy the divine Teacher who brought life and immortality to light. The new and world-agitating ideas of Christianity were every-where renovating society. The old faiths were fading out of the firmament of human thought. The old gods were reeling on their thrones. It was the heroic period of the Christian Church. She was girding herself, like a noble athlete, for the conquest of mankind. She was engaged in deadly struggle with paganism for the possession of the race. On the side of the latter were all the resources of the empire—the victorious legions, the treasures of the East and West, the prestige of power and splendor, a vast hierarchy, an ancient and venerated national religion, and, most potent ally of all, the corruptions and lusts of the evil heart of man. To these Christianity opposed the omnipotence of its divine principles—its fervent love, its sublime virtue, its heroic self-sacrifice—and they proved victorious. In this conflict both evil and good were brought into strongest relief and most striking contrast.

Persecution was kindled to intensest rage against the new faith; but Christianity nerved itself to suffer with a quietness of spirit all that the wrath of man was able to inflict. Nay, the hour of its sorest trial was that also of its noblest triumph. A moral Hercules even in its infancy, around its cradle were strewn the strangled serpents of heathen superstitions, vain philosophies, and pernicious heresies.

Ever since the revival of learning, this period has been the subject of exhaustive study by successive generations of critical scholars. It has been the battle-ground fought over, inch by inch, by orthodox and skeptical polemics. Its contemporary literature has been the armory which has furnished weapons both for the attack and the defense of the truth. The names of Fabricius, Mosheim, Echard, Bingham, Cave, King, Jortin, Milner, Milman, Neander, Gieseler, Schaff, Killen, Lea, Merivale, Gibbon, Strauss, Baur, Renan, and Lecky, do not exhaust the list of those who have gleaned rich harvests in these oft-reaped fields. Our author will not suffer by comparison with even the chiefest of these great lights of literature; and for perspicuity and elegance of style, skillin grouping, warmth of coloring, and picturesqueness of detail, he is scarce equaled by any of them. He has proved that, treated by the hand of a master, the interest of the subject is not exhausted. The more accurate processes of inquiry employed by modern criticism have dissipated many errors and developed many new truths. The recent discovery of long-lost writings of the period, and the study of its monumental evidences in the Catacombs and elsewhere, assists us to rehabilitate the past, and to comprehend its spirit better than modern writers have hitherto been able.

Dr. De Pressensé possesses in the highest degree the qualities requisite for the noble task he has undertaken. He unites, in unusual wedlock, a calm and philosophical judgment with a brilliant and poetical imagination. Instead, therefore, of the mere dry bones of history, he presents the living form and spirit of the times.

The sparkling grace of the French language, and the sprightly quality of the French intellect, make French historical literature a model of its class. Yet we are haunted by the

Persecution was kindled to intensest rage against the new faith; but Christianity nerved itself to suffer with a quietness of spirit all that the wrath of man was able to inflict. Nay, the hour of its sorest trial was that also of its noblest triumph. A moral Hercules even in its infancy, around its cradle was strewn the strangled serpents of heathen superstitions, vain philosophies, and pernicious heresies.

Ever since the revival of learning, this period has been the subject of exhaustive study by successive generations of critical scholars. It has been the battle-ground fought over, inch by inch, by orthodox and skeptical polemics. Its contemporary literature has been the armory which has furnished weapons both for the attack and the defense of the truth. The names of Fabricius, Mosheim, Eckard, Bingham, Cave, King, Jortin, Milner, Milman, Neander, Gieseler, Schaff, Killen, Lea, Merivale, Gibbon, Strauss, Baur, Renan, and Lecky, do not exhaust the list of those who have gleaned rich harvests in these oft-reaped fields. Our author will not suffer by comparison with even the chiefest of these great lights of literature; and for perspicuity and elegance of style, and in graphic warmth of coloring, and picturesqueness of detail, he is rarely equaled by any of them. He has proved that, treated by the hand of a master, the interest of the subject is not exhausted. The more accurate processes of inquiry employed by modern criticism have dissipated many errors and developed many new truths. The recent discovery of long-lost writings of the period, and the study of its monumental evidences in the Catacombs and elsewhere, assists us to rehabilitate the past, and to comprehend its spirit better than modern writers have hitherto been able.

Dr. De Pressensé possesses in the highest degree the qualities requisite for the noble task he has undertaken. He unites, in unusual wedlock, a calm and philosophical judgment with a brilliant and poetical imagination. Instead, therefore, of the mere dry bones of history, he presents the living form and spirit of the times.

The sparkling grace of the French language, and the sprightly quality of the French intellect, make French historical literature a model of its class. Yet we are haunted by the fear, when reading the brilliant pages of Lamartine or Renan, or even the graver volumes of Michelet or Guizot, that historical accuracy is sometimes sacrificed to epigrammatic force. This is not the case when reading Pressensé. While characterized by the highest graces of style, he also gives evidence of that profound and accurate scholarship so essential to the investigation of the many difficulties of the subject. Every important statement is fortified by references to the original authorities, or by citations from their text; and we feel that we are walking on the solid ground of historical fact. The entire work sparkles with beautiful and appropriate imagery, like a royal robe with broidery of gems and gold; but the fabric itself is firmly woven, and would still be rich and strong even if stripped of the ornament.

We cannot too highly praise the fidelity and skill with which the fair translator has accomplished her work. It is no easy matter to translate the vivacious pages of Pressensé into terse and idiomatic English without some of the subtle aroma of style escaping in the process; yet this difficult task Miss Harwood has achieved with signal success.

We can give the merest outline of the scope of this volume, which, while the member of a series, yet possesses a completeness and unity in itself. Its first part is occupied with the tragic tale of persecution. The world will never tire of the story of those heroic days of the Church's trial and triumph. Like a grand Homeric battle-scene, to use the figure of Baur,* the conflict between the noble "wrestlers of God" and the hosts of paganism passes before us. But an incomparably loftier moral principle inspires the Christian champions than that of the Greek athletes. The Church, in an age of luxury and self-indulgence, may well revert to those days of fiery trial, and catch inspiration from the faith and zeal and lofty courage, unfaltering even in the agonies of death, of the primitive confessors and witnesses for God. Amid dense moral darkness they held aloft the torch of truth, and handed down from age to age the torn yet triumphant banner of the faith, dyed with their heart's best blood. The noble words in which Tertullian flings down the gage of battle to the pagan foe still thrill the soul like the sound of a clarion: "We say, and

---

* *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung*, p. 20.

before all men we say, and torn and bleeding under your tortures we cry out, 'We worship God through Christ.' . . . Rend us with your hooks, hang us on crosses, wrap us in flames, behead us with the sword, let loose wild beasts upon us, the very attitude of the Christian praying is a preparation for all punishment. . . . We conquer in dying, and are victorious when subdued. The flames are our victory robe and our triumphal car. . . . Kill us, torture us, condemn us, grind us to powder. The oftener you mow us down the more we grow. The martyr's blood is the seed of the Church. When we are condemned by you we are acquitted by God."* "You can kill us," says Justin Martyr, "but you cannot harm us." †

In a previous volume Pressensé has recorded the atrocities of the Neronian persecution, when, to use the words of Tacitus, "some of the Christians were sewed up in the skins of wild beasts and worried to death by dogs; some were crucified; and some, wrapped in garments of pitch, were burned as torches to illumine the night." ‡ In the present volume he describes the more striking events of martyr history in the second and third centuries. Few of these are of higher dramatic interest than the death of the venerable Ignatius of Antioch. An eager multitude fills the vast Coliseum to see the frail old man, bowed with years of toil and worn with travel, "butchered to make a Roman holiday." The signal is given; the dens are opened; the fierce Numidian lions, famished with fasting, bound upon their prey, and a few fragments of scattered bones are soon all that remains of the martyr Bishop. His desire is fulfilled. "I am the wheat of God," he said, "and I shall be ground by the teeth of wild beasts, that I may become the pure bread of Christ." §

From the crowded amphitheater of Smyrna ascended, as in a chariot of fire, the soul of the apostolic Bishop Polycarp. The arrowy Rhone ran red with martyrs' blood. The names of the venerable Pothinus, of the youthful Blandina and Ponticus, and of the valiant Symphorianus, will be memories of thrilling power to the end of time. At Rome persecution

---

* *Apologeticus*, cc. 21, 30, 50.

† *Apol.*, i.

‡ *Ann.*, xv, 44.

§ *Ep. ad Romanos*, § 5.

selected some of its noblest victims. Justin, the Christian philosopher, finding in the Gospels a loftier love than in the teachings of Zeno or Aristotle, of Pythagoras or Plato, became the foremost of the goodly phalanx of apologists and confessors of the faith, and sealed his testimony with his blood.

Still, with intervals of treacherous calm, persecution raged against the Christians; and Paganism, in the death-throes of its mortal agony, wreaked its wrath upon its hapless victims. *Non licet esse vos*—"It is not lawful for you to exist," was the stern edict of extirpation pronounced against them. But like the rosemary and thyme, which the more they are bruised give out the richer perfume, Christianity breathed forth the odors of sanctity which are fragrant in the world to-day. From the martyrs' blood, more prolific than the fabled dragon's teeth, new hosts of Christian heroes rose, contending for the martyrs' starry and unwithering crowns.

Like the trump of jubilee, the edict of toleration pealed through the land. It penetrated the gloomy dungeon, the darksome mine, the catacomb's dim labyrinth; and from their somber depths vast processions of "noble wrestlers of religion"* thronged to the long-forsaken churches with grateful songs of praise to God.

Such lavish waste of life and wanton cruelty as the records of martyrdom narrate seem almost incredible; but the pages of the contemporary historians give too minute and circumstantial accounts of the tortures of which they were eye-witnesses to allow us to adopt the complacent theory of Gibbon, that these sufferings were comparatively few and insignificant. "We ourselves have seen," says Eusebius, "crowds of persons, some beheaded, others burned alive, in a single day, so that the murderous weapons were blunted and broken to pieces, and the executioners, weary with slaughter, were obliged to give over the work of blood."† Men whose only crime was their love of God were scourged with iron wires, or with *plumbatæ*, that is, chains laden with bronze balls, till their flesh hung in shreds, and even their bones were broken; they were bound in chains of red-hot iron and roasted over fires so slow that they lingered for hours, or even days, in mortal agony; the

---

*Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, ix, 1.

† *Ibid.*, viii, 9.

flesh was scraped from the very bone with ragged shells, or lacerated with burning pincers and *ungulæ*, or horrid claws of iron, specimens of which have been found in the catacombs. Plates of red-hot brass and molten metal were applied to the naked body, till it became one indistinguishable wound. Mingled salt and vinegar or unslaked lime were rubbed upon the quivering muscles, torn and bleeding from the rack and scourge. Men were condemned by the score and hundred to labor in the mines with the sinews of one leg severed, one eye scooped out, and the socket seared with a red-hot iron. Chaste matrons and tender virgins were given over—worse fate a thousand-fold than death!—to dens of shame and the gladiators' lust, and subjected to nameless agonies too horrible for words to utter. And all these untold sufferings were endured, often with joy and exultation, for the love of a Divine Master, when a single word, a grain of incense cast upon the heathen altar, would have released the victims from their agonies. No lapse of time, and no recoil from the idolatrous homage paid in after ages to the martyr's relics, should impair in our hearts the profound and rational reverence with which we bend before his tomb.

One of the most remarkable features of the ages of persecution was the enthusiasm for martyrdom that prevailed, at times almost like an epidemic.* Age after age the soldiers of Christ rallied to the conflict, whose highest reward was the guerdon of death. They bound persecution as a wreath about their brows, and exulted in the "glorious infamy" of suffering for their Lord. The brand of shame became the badge of highest honor. Besides the joys of heaven, they won imperishable fame on earth; and the memory of a humble slave was often haloed with a glory surpassing that of a Curtius or Horatius. The meanest hind was ennobled by the accolade of martyrdom to the loftiest peerage of the skies. Impatient to obtain the prize, these candidates for death often pressed with eager

---

* "Are there not ropes and precipices enough?" said a Roman proconsul to a Christian mob that came clamoring for martyrdom. Many of the Fathers protested against this infatuation. "Who calls me a martyr scourges me," said Ignatius on his way to death. "That name belongs to Christ alone," said the martyrs of Vienne. Tertullian fanned this enthusiasm, but Clement sought to repress it. "They are not martyrs, but suicides," he wrote, "who light their own funeral pyres." By precept and example Cyprian enforced an opposite course.

haste to seize the palm of victory and the martyr's crown. They went to the stake as joyfully as to a marriage-feast; and "their fetters," says Eusebius, "seemed like the golden ornaments of a bride." Though weak in body, they seemed clothed with vicarious strength, and confident that, though "counted as sheep for the slaughter," naught could separate them from the love of Christ. Wrapped in the fiery vest and shroud of flame, they yet exulted in their glorious victory. While the leaden hail fell on the mangled frame, and the eyes filmed with the shadows of death, the spirit was entranced by the vision of the opening heaven, and above the roar of the ribald mob fell sweetly on the inner ear the assurance of eternal life.

This spirit of martyrdom was a new principle in society. It had no classical counterpart. Socrates and Seneca suffered with fortitude, but not with faith. The loftiest pagan philosophy shrinks abashed before the sublimity of Christian hope. This looks beyond the shadows of time and the cares of earth to the grandeur of the infinite and the eternal. The heroic deaths of the believers exhibited a spiritual power mightier than the primal instincts of nature—the love of wife or child, or even of life itself. Like a solemn voice falling on the dull ear of mankind, these holy examples urged the inquiry, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" And that voice awakened an echo in full many a heart; the martyrs made more converts by their deaths than in their lives. "Who that sees our sufferings," says Tertullian, "is not excited to inquiring? Who that inquires does not embrace our faith?" *

The second section of Pressensé's volume treats of the post-apostolic Fathers and Apologists. Comparatively few, even of those who have the ability, have the time or opportunity to read the Fathers in the original. Yet without some acquaintance with their writings it is impossible to understand the spirit of the age in which they lived, the moral atmosphere of the times, and the social environment of that primitive Christianity to which they so largely gave the impress of their own character. There were, indeed, giants in the earth in those days—giants of evil as well as of good—men of renown in wickedness, prodigies of cruelty and vice, and men of

---

* *Apol.*, 50.

colossal Christian character, who performed undying labors for God and man. The battles for and against the truth were wars of the Titans; and in the massy works they left behind we have evidences of the prowess of the Christian champions. Nowhere can he who is unfamiliar with this noble brotherhood better make their acquaintance than in the vivid portraits and characterizations of this book; and he who is already familiar with them will enjoy with still keener zest the discriminative criticism and analysis of their character given by our author. These portraits are clearly limned, and give the individuality of the person in full relief. They are not blurred and faded copies of each other, nor bloodless specters of superhuman virtue like the Romish Saints, but men of like passions with ourselves, often with a touch of human error or infirmity, which makes us feel their kinship to our souls.

We see Justin Martyr, an earnest seeker after God, a type of the nobler thought of the age in which he lived, turning from school to school, from teacher to teacher, till at the feet of Jesus he found that rest unto his soul which neither the stern, cold doctrines of Zeno, nor the sublime musings of Plato, could impart. Like another Paul, he became a faithful confessor of Jesus; and with apostolic zeal he proclaimed the new-found truth of the Gospel, even unto death. It was a fire in his soul that could not be repressed. "Every man who can bear witness to the truth," he exclaims, "and does it not, will be judged of God." When arraigned before the heathen prefect, he was asked if he expected to ascend to heaven when beheaded. "I know it: beyond all power of doubt, I *know* it," he replied, and went rejoicing to his fate.

The marvelous vari-colored life of Alexandria—a sort of newer Athens or older Paris—a city of blended luxury and learning, folly and philosophy, heathen vice and Christian virtue, is vividly portrayed. We sit at the feet of Clement and Origen, the noble teachers of her Christian schools. With a lofty eclecticism they culled the fairest flowers from the garden of heathen philosophy, and distilled healing simples from its often poisonous fruit. They sifted the golden grains of truth and pearls of thought from the ancient religions of paganism to adorn the brow of Christianity. They recogcolossal Christian character, who performed undying labors for God and man. The battles for and against the truth were wars of the Titans; and in the massy works they left behind us have evidences of the prowess of the Christian champions. Nowhere can he who is unfamiliar with this noble brotherhood better make their acquaintance than in the vivid portraits and characterizations of this book; and he who is already familiar with them will enjoy with still keener zest the discriminative criticism and analysis of their character given by our author. These portraits are clearly limned, and give the individuality of the person in full relief. They are not blurred and faded copies of each other, nor bloodless specters of superhuman virtue like the Romish Saints, but men of like passions with ourselves, often with a touch of human error or infirmity, which makes us feel their kinship to our souls.

We see Justin Martyr, an earnest seeker after God, a type of the nobler thought of the age in which he lived, turning from school to school, from teacher to teacher, till at the feet of Jesus he found that rest unto his soul which neither the stern, cold doctrines of Zeno, nor the sublime musings of Plato, could impart. Like another Paul, he became a faithful confessor of Jesus; and with apostolic zeal he proclaimed the new-found truth of the Gospel, even unto death. It was a fire in his soul that could not be repressed. "Every man who can bear witness to the truth," he exclaims, "and does it not, will be judged of God." When arraigned before the heathen prefect, he was asked if he expected to ascend to heaven when beheaded. "I know it: beyond all power of doubt, I know it," he replied, and went rejoicing to his fate.

The marvelous vari-colored life of Alexandria—a sort of newer Athens or older Paris—a city of blended luxury and learning, folly and philosophy, heathen vice and Christian virtue, is vividly portrayed. We sit at the feet of Clement and Origen, the noble teachers of her Christian schools. With a lofty eclecticism they culled the fairest flowers from the garden of heathen philosophy, and distilled healing simples from its often poisonous fruit. They sifted the golden grains of truth and pearls of thought from the ancient religions of paganism to adorn the brow of Christianity. They were nized the grand conception, so nobly expressed by Milton, that as the Egyptian Typhon hewed in pieces the god Osiris, so the virgin form of Truth has been rent and scattered to the four winds of heaven. Hence, as Isis anxiously searched for the mangled body of Osiris, so the eager seekers after Truth must gather mangled limb by limb wherever they can find them.*

With loving minuteness our author lingers over the character of Origen, whom he styles "one of the greatest theologians and greatest saints the Church has ever possessed." He was the noblest of the Christian Fathers and Apologists. The heroic son of a martyred sire, he fought valiantly, by tongue and pen, the battles of the faith, and won at last the martyr's crown. To the zeal of Paul he united the tenderness of John. His whole life was a perfumed altar-fire of love,† never dimmed by obloquy, nor fanned into flames of hate by opposition or persecution, but glowing brighter and brighter till his frail and emaciated body was consumed.

In striking contrast with this noble magnanimity is the fiery and intolerant zeal of Tertullian, the greatest of the Western Fathers. He beams not with the calm mild light of Hesper on the brow of eve like Origen, but burns like a blazing meteor, presaging wrath to man. The fervid heat of his native African skies seems transfused into his veins. Born in the midst of the corrupt and semi-barbaric civilization of Carthage, and trained in the literary jugglery of the times, he became an adept, at once in Carthagenian vice, and in the florid eloquence of the decaying empire. His energy of character made him as pre-eminent in wicked indulgence as he afterward became in rigorous asceticism. His literary characteristics are thus strikingly described by Pressensé:

> His style is, in fact, the exact expression of his soul; it is strong even to hardness; it is strained, incorrect, African, but irresistible. It is poured forth like lava from an inward furnace, kept ever at white heat, and the track of light it leaves is a track of fire too. It abounds in bold and splendid images, but there is nothing gentle or joyous in its brilliancy; it is not the calm brightness of the sun; it is the strange lurid fire which wreathes round the summit of the volcano, and rises in red smoke. The

---

* "Plea for Unlicensed Printing."

† "Love," he says, over and over, "is an agony, a passion: *caritas est passio.*"

> language of Tertullian is full of sharp and abrupt antitheses, like those which characterize his thoughts. . . . In every phrase one might seem to hear the sharp clash of swords that meet and cross, and the spark which dazzles us is struck from the ringing steel. Hence that incomparable eloquence which, in spite of sophisms and exaggerated metaphors, ravishes and rules us still.[*]

The burning intensity of his convictions often leads Tertullian to excessive vehemence of expression. He does not recognize, like the philosophic Clement or Origen, the germs of goodness in things evil, but overwhelms with vituperation and invective every thing connected with paganism. He exults in the anticipation of the near approach of the day of wrath, which should consume the wicked as stubble; nay, he himself would fain call down fire from heaven to destroy them. This unamiable trait is thus justly characterized by our author:

> This joy in the anticipation of the doom of the enemies of Christ is altogether alien to the spirit of the Gospel; that mocking laugh, ringing across the abyss which opens to swallow up the persecutors; this cruel irony over the most fearful woes; all those fiery characters on the page, are evidences of Tertullian's passionate attachment to the cause of Christianity, and also of his intense hatred to every thing opposed to it. . . . Hence the implacable, cutting, sardonic tone of his apologetic writings. He does not, like Justin or Clement of Alexandria, seek to trace in paganism a dim preparation for Christianity. He takes the ax of John the Baptist, and lays it at the root of the tree, with the full intention to cut it down and consume it utterly.[†]

Yet, conscious of his mental infirmity, he exclaims, "Me miserable, ever sick with hot impatience! I am like the sick who laud the blessings of the health they lack." In his tract on Prayer he breathes out the yearnings of his soul for God. "How daring it is," he exclaims, "to pass one day without praying!" He recognizes the providence of God as numbering even the bristles of the swine, as well as the hairs of his children. He beautifully portrays the conjugal felicity, in prayer and praise and loving fellowship, of the Christian husband and wife; yet even this is tinged with stern asceticism. In violation of the parental instinct of the human soul, he deprecates the "bitter, bitter pleasure of children"[‡] on account of the troubles that they bring. He inveighs against all fe-

---

[*] Pp. 382–3.

[†] Pp. 388–9.

[‡] Librorum amarissima voluptate. *Ad ux.* v.

male adorning as the funeral pomp of the soul; and especially denounces the wearing the hair of others, "the slough, perhaps, of some guilty wretch now in hell."

His apology for the Christians is rather a haughty defiance of paganism. He returns scorn for scorn, and fiery invective for reproach. But it is especially in controversy with heretics, whose pernicious doctrines, he asserts, destroy the soul as fever the body, that his fierce intolerance is exhibited. In later days he would have been a Torquemada or St. Dominic. He can find no language intense enough to brand the heretic Marcian, against whom his largest treatise is written—"a man," he says, "more savage than the Scythian, more inhuman than the Massagetæ, fiercer than the whirlwind, more gloomy than the thunder-cloud, colder than winter, more rugged than Caucasus."* "Tertullian," says Pressensé, "is like a turbid mountain torrent, Origen like a full, majestic river. The words of the latter flash like lightning, those of the former roll like thunder. The one discourses like a philosopher, the other harangues like a popular tribune."

The character of Cyprian, the martyr Bishop of Carthage, seems cold and colorless beside that of Tertullian. Calm, mild, prudent, led by judgment rather than by feeling, he is the very antithesis of the latter. During the Decian persecution he retired to a place of safety, that he might by his counsels guide the persecuted flock of Christ. That fidelity, not fear, was his motive, he showed by his heroic martyrdom when he felt that God's time had come. "The Emperors command thee to sacrifice," said the prefect. "I shall not obey," he replied: "fulfill your orders; in such a cause there needs no deliberation;" and he went rejoicing to his death.

We can only briefly notice the closing section of the book—a comprehensive survey of the attack and defense of Christianity in the domain of controversy. Our author sees not merely the picturesque aspect of things; he looks beneath the surface, and discovers their secret causes. His analysis of the spirit of the age, and of the reasons of the opposition to Christianity, exhibit a depth of Christian philosophy that puts to shame the shallow sophistries of Gibbon on the same subject. The various schools of philosophy—"Impious Epicureanism,

---

* *Adv. Marc.* 1.

proud Platonism, Oriental philosophy, and the subtle and mystical Pantheism of Alexandria, each in turn battered on the breach." All the conservative elements of society feared those subversive principles which threatened to undermine the worm-eaten fabric of ancient superstition. The haughty pagans resented the attempt of Christianity to solve the mysteries which so long had foiled the wisest of men. They met with sneering contempt or mocking laugh, like the Greeks on the Areopagus, the doctrine of the resurrection.

The delineation of these attacks on Christianity proves our author no less familiar with pagan than with Christian literature. The space given to Lucian, the scoffing atheist who mocked alike at Jove and Jesus, seems disproportioned to his relative importance; yet we would not have it less. The analysis of his character is masterly. "Lucian, like all his class," says Pressensé, "was not satisfied with rooting out the seeds from the field; he carried away with them the fruitful soil. He destroyed not superstition only, but the very faculty of faith. The human soul, when he has breathed upon it, resembles a desolate region sown with salt. True, no more weeds appear, but utter barrenness reigns in their stead. There is one thing more deplorable than believing in error, and that is to believe in nothing; this is the essential error, the fundamental aberration of the soul, the invincible obstacle to truth." Although he assailed paganism, he was not the ally of Christianity. "The voice that prepares the way of the Lord," Pressensé impressively remarks, "comes from the desert of conflict, not from the festal halls where wine-bibbers hold their impious revelry."

In these attacks on Christianity the keen dialectical skill of the Greek intellect employed the very weapons which modern skepticism has refurbished for the same purpose. Most of the arguments of Baur, Strauss, Renan, and Colenso are to be found in Porphyry and Celsus. Of the latter Pressensé remarks, "He collected in his quiver all the objections possible to be made, and there is scarcely one missing of all the arrows which in subsequent times have been aimed against the supernatural in Christianity." Then, as now, the fiercest battle waged around the great central truth of Christianity—the essential divinity of our Lord, who was held up to scorn by the

heathen as a "crucified impostor." The philosophic theolosophy of the East, appealing to the syncretism of the age, sought to substitute for the divine evangel of Christ the motley gospel of Apollonius of Tyana, a mere plagiarism of the character and work of Jesus. The Church itself was rent by numerous factions, schisms, and heresies—

> The clashing of creeds, and the strife
> Of the many beliefs that in vain
> Perplexed men's heart and brain—

till, in the Homoousion controversy, all Christendom was divided about a single diphthong.

Against these manifold attacks on the faith the primitive Fathers and Apologists valiantly contended. They solved for all time the many doubts and difficulties which audacious paganism in its last throes propounded. They followed heretical errors through all the dialectical windings of controversy, employing, for the most part, the flexible and copious Greek language, which was the only existing vehicle adequate for the expression of the vast and complex ideas of Christianity. Thus the new wine of the Gospel flowed from that classic chalice which so long had poured libations to the gods. Yet, with rare exceptions, the fathers defended the faith against the heathen and heretics in the spirit of meekness and of love. They sought rather to persuade men by the Orphic melodies of truth, and to convince the erring judgment by argument, than, as in after evil days, to coerce by external authority, or to hurl anathemas against recusant heretics. Even the impetuous Tertullian reverences the inviolable dignity of the human conscience, and asserts the broad and noble principle of toleration, which the heart of Christendom is so slow to learn. "It is," he says, "a fundamental human right that every man should worship according to his own convictions. It is no part of religion," he adds, "to compel religion." * The saintly Origen, as gentle as Fénelon or Fletcher, was an illustrious example of a magnanimous Christian controversialist. Of a deceased heretic, whose works he felt it a duty to confute, he says, "I love him, because he is dead."

We rise from the study of the subject which this book so

---

* *De Testimonio Animæ* ii.

admirably treats with profounder conceptions than ever of the nobleness, the purity, the holy enthusiasm, the true sublimity of the Christianity of those early centuries of fiery trial and martyrdom. It seems beautifully symbolized in the legend of St. Agnes, the Roman maiden of sweet and tender beauty, wooed by a pagan prince, but, true to her espousal to her heavenly bridegroom, rejecting with scorn his suit. She walked as in ecstatic vision, ever in her celestial spouse's presence, and, even amid tortures, proved faithful to his love. But we are haunted with the prescience of the near approaching period when this spotless bride of heaven shall forget her espousal vows, and, yielding to the seductions of earthly love, be wedded with imperial power; from which unhallowed union shall be born the brood of corruptions and vices which shall in after time despoil the fair inheritance of Christ.

ART. II.—WHAT IS THE FUTURE CONDITION OF THE WICKED?

THE question implies that the wicked have a future; its terms preclude the supposition of annihilation. Annihilation is extinction of being, *reduction to nothingness* and nonentity cannot properly be spoken of as a condition, which Webster defines as "a particular frame, form, mode, or disposition, in which a thing exists, at any given time." Upon the admission of the annihilation of the wicked, when the present life terminates, they simply *are not;* they cannot be said *to be* in any *condition.* If they are, their annihilation is contradicted.

The question submitted is mainly one of consistent biblical exegesis. To the Scriptures the final appeal must be made for certainty concerning the doom awaiting the wicked, and when we have reached a just interpretation of their utterances we have reached the truth. The rules of biblical interpretation are now so well adjusted, and universally recognized by scholars representing all the great schools of theology, that their application, when fairly made, may be expected to lead to results worthy of unqualified credence, may be expected to develop the real meaning of the sacred text. This remark at least

holds good in respect to every such important, yea, fundamental, matter as the destiny of souls hereafter.

In any discussion of our subject claiming to be exhaustive, philosophical arguments, drawn from our moral constitution, the tendencies of virtue and vice as they are manifested around us, the principles which must be assumed to enter into a divine government, if there be any, and the almost uniform testimony of religions reported to us in history, would properly have a place. Their chief use, however, is in confirming the truth of God as it addresses us in his word, in showing that there is harmony between the two divine revelations—the written and unwritten—and in meeting objections which themselves originate in the field of philosophical speculation, thus helping a class of thinkers who are honest in seeking truth, but who seem to need an extraordinary accumulation of evidence, who fail to see that, where a thing is fairly proved, objections which spring out of what we do not know can have no weight against it. Arguments of this kind are purposely omitted from this discussion, the limited space at command forbidding their introduction. Our aim will be merely to present the subject in some of its great outlines as the Bible seems to present it; in a word, to answer the question as the New Testament answers it.

It may be pronounced unnecessary, we think, in maintaining the orthodox doctrine respecting the final condition of the wicked, to lay any great stress upon the words *Gehenna*, *Sheol*, and *Hades*, certainly upon the last two. The examinations of modern scholarship leave it an open question, to say the least, whether *Hades* or *Sheol* can be relied on as descriptive of the final state of the wicked. "It is undoubtedly true," says Dr. Dwight in his Theology, "that the Hebrew *Sheol* and the Greek *Hades*, commonly rendered hell, or the grave, in our translation, do not properly signify either, but always *the world of departed spirits.* As these words have so extensive a signification, and must be interpreted by every passage of Scripture referring to that world, there must be room for considerable difference of opinion." Dr. Campbell, an eminent biblical critic, says: "In my judgment it (*Hades*) ought never in Scripture to be rendered *hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians." Alford, commenting on Luke xvi, 23, says: "Hades (שְׁאוֹל) is the abode holds good in respect to every such important, yea, fundamental, matter as the destiny of souls hereafter.

In any discussion of our subject claiming to be exhaustive, philosophical arguments, drawn from our moral constitution, the tendencies of virtue and vice as they are manifested around us, the principles which must be assumed to enter into a divine government, if there be any, and the almost uniform testimony of religions reported to us in history, would properly have a place. Their chief use, however, is in confirming the truth of God as it addresses us in his word, in showing that there is harmony between the two divine revelations—the written and unwritten—and in meeting objections which themselves originate in the field of philosophical speculation, thus helping a class of thinkers who are honest in seeking truth, but who seem to need an extraordinary accumulation of evidence, who fail to see that, where a thing is fairly proved, objections which spring out of what we do not know can have no weight against it. Arguments of this kind are purposely omitted from this discussion, the limited space at command forbidding their introduction. Our aim will be merely to present the subject in some of its great outlines as the Bible seems to present it; in a word, to answer the question as the New Testament answers it.

It may be pronounced unnecessary, we think, in maintaining the orthodox doctrine respecting the final condition of the wicked, to lay any great stress upon the words *Gehenna*, *Sheol*, and *Hades*, certainly upon the last two. The examinations of modern scholarship leave it an open question, to say the least, whether *Hades* or *Sheol* can be relied on as descriptive of the final state of the wicked. "It is undoubtedly true," says Dr. Dwight in his Theology, "that the Hebrew *Sheol* and the Greek *Hades*, commonly rendered hell, or the grave, in our translation, do not properly signify either, but always *the world of departed spirits*. As these words have so extensive a signification, and must be interpreted by every passage of Scripture referring to that world, there must be room for considerable difference of opinion." Dr. Campbell, an eminent biblical critic, says: "In my judgment it (*Hades*) ought never in Scripture to be rendered *hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians." Alford, commenting on Luke xvi, 23, says: "Hades (ᾅδης) is the abode of *all disembodied spirits* till the resurrection; not the place of torment, much less *hell*, as understood commonly in the English version. Lazarus was *also in Hades*, but separated from Dives: one on the blissful, the other on the baleful side." Dr. Whedon's comment on the same text is concurrent with that of Alford as to the meaning of "*Hades*, or the great *unseen*," adding, because "it is overshadowed by the power of death, . . . and is the place of *detention* even for the good, the word *Hades* is sometimes, as here, used as the proper name of the compartment of the wicked only."

Sheol, for which the Seventy have almost invariably substituted ᾅδης, and to which there is satisfactory evidence for believing the New Testament *Hades* answers, according to Robinson, in his Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, "signified . . . *the under world*, and was held to be a vast subterranean place, full of thickest darkness, where dwelt the shades of the dead; but no distinction of place is indicated in the *Sheol* of the Old Testament between the righteous and the wicked." Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, under the word *Hell*, says "this is the word generally and unfortunately used by our translators to render the Hebrew *Sheol*. . . . It would, perhaps, have been better to retain the Hebrew word *Sheol*, or else render it always by the grave or the pit."

Gehenna is not open to the objection of indeterminateness which is urged against the other words. There is almost universal agreement among the best authorities that, in the New Testament, it denotes the place of future punishment. There ought to be no doubt. For example, the words of our Lord, Matt. x, 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in (*Gehenna*) hell;" and in Mark ix, 47, 48: "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into the *Gehenna* of fire, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," can refer to nothing else than a place of future punishment. The valley of Hinnom, the name of which, *Ge Hinnom*, (*Gehenna*,) was freely used by the Jewish Rabbis to denote a place of future torment, furnished the illustration; at that time no more appropriate and impressive one could have been found; but to

make *Gehenna* in these verses refer exclusively to that valley, or to any conceivable punishment in this world, is to make the Saviour speak absurdly, contradictorily.

Gehenna occurs twelve times in the New Testament. "In ten of these," says a distinguished scholar, "there can be no doubt that it refers to the abode of final punishment in the future world: in the other two places the expression is figurative; but it will scarcely admit of a question that the figure is taken from that state of misery which awaits the impenitent. Thus the Pharisees are said to make the proselyte, whom they compass sea and land to gain, twofold more the child of (*Gehenna*) hell than themselves; an expression both similar in form and equivalent in signification to *son, or child, of the devil*, and *son, or child, of perdition.* In the other passage an unruly tongue is said to be set on fire of (*Gehenna*) hell. These two cannot be considered as exceptions, it being the manifest intention of the writers in both to draw an illustration of the subject from that state of perfect wretchedness." Says Smith's Dictionary of the Bible: "The word most frequently used in the New Testament for the place of future punishment is *Gehenna*, or *Gehenna* of fire."

And yet all these words, which more or less represent Jewish and, to some extent, gross ideas, and the chief use of which consists in suggesting locality in connection with the future of the wicked, and in supplying a convenient terminology for expressing it—all these words may be dropped from the discussion of this subject, and the strength of the proof adducible in support of what we receive as the truth will not be diminished. The future condition of the wicked is not left—we cannot suppose that it would be left—to be alone inferred from such bare terms. Whatever it may be, we may expect to find it clearly, unmistakably declared;—declared in language which will carry conviction, with all the force of intuition, to every unperverted, ingenuous, studious mind. Hell, as pointing to an unknown place in the unmeasured universe of God, may be eliminated from the vocabulary of language, and yet the future condition of the wicked stands out in bold relief on the pages of the divine book, warning them that it shall be ill with them; that, though hand join in hand, they shall not go unpunished.

And now as to the future condition of the wicked. The

following are the essential points upon which the word of God sheds light. And so full is the light poured upon them as to leave the pulpit not only without excuse, but criminally unfaithful, when it shuns to declare "the whole counsel of God," or gives an uncertain sound in respect to them.

1. In the world to come, as here, the wicked will be known as a distinct class, unlike and separate from the righteous, only the distinction and separation will then be more marked and perfect than is possible under the circumstances of probationary life. They are spoken of as to the future as they are spoken of here: they are the same—still the wicked, the unbelieving, the condemned, the lost. The good have a place of their own; so have the wicked—a place of different name and opposite nature. Pursuant to the decisions of the great testing day, they "go away," away from the good, to be forever away, a community by themselves. None will be, or ever can be, among them who do not belong to them. In manifold ways in the divine record, in describing the future of the good and bad respectively, the discrimination of character is observed, and the representations are such as to preclude the thought that they will ever come together,—that the one class will ever be merged in the other.

2. In the future the wicked are *punished;* they are the subjects of the retributive justice of the Divine Being.

There is a disposition on the part of some who hold to the future misery of such as die impenitent, to explain away or soften down the judicial aspect of the divine character: its amiableness is dwelt upon and distorted; and, by means of strained and wholly inapplicable illustrations, God is practically made out unwilling or afraid to execute the penalty of his law. He threatens—but it is only make-believe. He does not mean the sinner to believe that he is angry with him, though he says so. So a most shocking sentimentalism is indulged in the treatment of a subject from which, of all others, every thing approaching sentimentalism should be excluded.

God is indeed love. The New Testament gives a conception of the vastness, the glorious condescension, the amazing resources, of his love, which is almost overwhelming, when in the Epistle to Titus (iii, 4) it holds him forth as the world-embracing, the world-seeking *Philanthropist,* ("Οτε δὲ ἡ following are the essential points upon which the word of God sheds light. And so full is the light poured upon them as to leave the pulpit not only without excuse, but criminally unfaithful, when it shuns to declare "the whole counsel of God," or gives an uncertain sound in respect to them.

1. In the world to come, as here, the wicked will be known as a distinct class, unlike and separate from the righteous, only the distinction and separation will then be more marked and perfect than is possible under the circumstances of probationary life. They are spoken of as to the future as they are spoken of here: they are the same—still the wicked, the unbelieving, the condemned, the lost. The good have a place of their own; so have the wicked—a place of different name and opposite nature. Pursuant to the decisions of the great testing day, they "go away," away from the good, to be forever away, a community by themselves. None will be, or ever can be, among them who do not belong to them. In manifold ways in the divine record, in describing the future of the good and bad respectively, the discrimination of character is observed, and the representations are such as to preclude the thought that they will ever come together,—that the one class will ever be merged in the other.

2. In the future the wicked are *punished*; they are the subjects of the retributive justice of the Divine Being.

There is a disposition on the part of some who hold to the future misery of such as die impenitent, to explain away or soften down the judicial aspect of the divine character; its benevolence is dwelt upon and distorted; and, by means of strained and wholly inapplicable illustrations, God is practically made out unwilling or afraid to execute the penalty of his law. He threatens—but it is only make-believe. He does not mean the sinner to believe that he is angry with him though he says so. So a most shocking sentimentalism is indulged in the treatment of a subject from which, of all others, every thing approaching sentimentalism should be excluded.

God is indeed love. The New Testament gives a conception of the vastness, the glorious condescension, the unsearchable resources, of his love, which is almost overwhelming. When in the Epistle to Titus (iii, 4) it holds him forth as the world-embracing, the world-seeking *Philanthropist*, (Gr. [illegible] τότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ. But God is no less love in punishing the incorrigible than in saving the penitent and believing sinner. In his wrathful no more than in his merciful visitations is one part of the divine nature compromised or sacrificed in order to exalt the other.

And while it is true the sinner entails upon himself the sufferings which belong to the world of woe, but eats the fruit of his doings, reaps what he has sown; while it is true that the anguish of his future is but sin working out its own, its natural, its inevitable results, it is none the less true that, by judicial sentence, he is bearing the infliction of divine penalty for wrong-doing, and that he will feel it most intensely and bitterly. The whole future experience of the wicked will be an experience of the power of the retributive justice of almighty God.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "The vengeance threatened," it is well remarked, "is not personal revenge, but judicial retribution. The word is to be taken in the old English sense of a just punishment for wrong-doing, which is the exact idea of the Greek word δίκη in the text—*judicial punishment.* God does not indulge toward the transgressor that feeling of malice and vindictiveness which we call revenge, but he *avenges* the evil done in his kingdom by inflicting upon the transgressor the penalty of the law!"

It should not be overlooked that the most dreadful averments concerning the future of sinners are those which fell from the lips of Jesus,—that he, who was full of compassion and tenderness, proclaimed distinctly the punitive justice of God; that the most startling enunciations of the New Testament upon this subject are his, and that he prophesied the hour when he should be the Judge of all men, and when, by his sentence, sinners should go away to endure the wrath of the Lamb.

3. The future condition of the wicked will be one of untold suffering.

The representations of the New Testament are absolutely appalling. Nothing that transpires here begins to answer to

them, and they can only be intended to leave upon the mind the impression of deepest woe as the portion of those who die in their sins. If we could center in one soul all known and unknown forms of earthly misery, the misery of perdition would be unapproached.

The wicked are "*cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth;*" they are *burned* "*with unquenchable fire;*" they "*drink of the wine of the wrath of God;*" they are "*tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb;*" "*the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever;*" the "*wrath of God abideth on them.*"

It is said these are *figurative* expressions. True; but *they mean something*, and the figure seldom exceeds—in this case could not approach—the reality. And the fact that such appalling figures are used by the Lord himself in describing the doom of the wicked, itself proves the terrible nature of that doom.

It is said, again, it is absurd to believe in a hell of material fire, in any such thing as a literal lake of fire and brimstone! We grant it. But material fire, the most torturing of all elements when applied to the body, is made the figure of the sufferings of the lost. Is not the conclusion forced upon us that these sufferings are of the most awful character? Can there be any other reason for the use of the figure?

4. The future condition of the wicked is a *changeless* one,—there are no remedial agencies at command to relieve their woe,—their punishment is an eternal punishment.

The only dispensation of mercy provided, as far as we know, is the one of the present; and our ignorance furnishes no rational basis for hope of another in the future. If another were intended or is possible, it may be presumed we would have some hints of it.

It is morally certain that, with all the restraints of divine grace withdrawn, and with every influence operating upon the soul tending to foster and aggravate its unchecked depravity, as will be the case in the world of woe, the sinner will forever keep on sinning, and thus God will be unimpeachable in his justice and goodness if he keeps on punishing forever. He can do nothing else without becoming unjust. But the endlessness of the state into which the wicked g them, and they can only be intended to leave upon the mind the impression of deepest woe as the portion of those who die in their sins. If we could center in one soul all known and unknown forms of earthly misery, the misery of perdition would be unapproached.

The wicked are "*cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth;*" they are *burned* "*with unquenchable fire;*" they "*drink of the wine of the wrath of God;*" they are "*tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb;*" "*the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever;*" the "*wrath of God abideth on them.*"

It is said these are *figurative* expressions. True; but they *mean something*, and the figure seldom exceeds—in this case could not approach—the reality. And the fact that such appalling figures are used by the Lord himself in describing the doom of the wicked, itself proves the terrible nature of that doom.

It is said, again, it is absurd to believe in a hell of material fire, in any such thing as a literal lake of fire and brimstone! We grant it. But material fire, the most torturing of all elements when applied to the body, is made the figure of the sufferings of the lost. Is not the conclusion forced upon us that these sufferings are of the most awful character? Can there be any other reason for the use of the figure?

4. The future condition of the wicked is a *changeless* one,—there are no remedial agencies at command to relieve their woe,—their punishment is an eternal punishment.

The only dispensation of mercy provided, so far as we know, is the one of the present; and our ignorance furnishes no rational basis for hope of another in the future. If another were intended or is possible, it may be presumed we would have some hints of it.

It is morally certain that, with all the restraints of divine grace withdrawn, and with every influence operating upon the soul tending to foster and aggravate its unchecked depravity, as will be the case in the world of woe, the sinner will forever keep on sinning, and thus God will be unimpeachable in his justice and goodness if he keeps on punishing forever. He can do nothing else without becoming unjust. But the endlessness of the state into which the wicked g at death is as unequivocally affirmed in the New Testament as any thing can be. Only two or three brief references are proposed.

Matt. xxv, 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." There ought to be no controversy concerning the import of these words. *Aionion* is the Greek word rendered in the first clause *everlasting*, and *eternal* in the second. This adjective, in the same number, gender, and case in both clauses, predicates respectively the duration of the punishment of the wicked and of the life of the righteous. If it means an indefinite period in one case, it may well be assumed, in the absence of all intimation to the contrary, that it means an indefinite period in the other. As far as this verse is concerned, every reason which can be assigned for limiting the punishment of the wicked holds good for limiting the happiness of the righteous.

It avails nothing to say that *aionion* is applied to things of only temporary duration. In every case the context and nature of the thing spoken of will prevent misapprehension. Examining the words to which the adjective is joined, we find that it is always used "to denote the longest period of which the subject mentioned in each case is capable." A "servant forever" is a servant during the whole period of his natural life, as long as he can be a servant. "Everlasting hills" and "everlasting mountains" mean hills and mountains remaining while the earth stands, as long as the conditions necessary to their continuance are undisturbed. When, therefore, Christ declares the punishment of the wicked to be everlasting, he must mean, unless he was ignorant of the purport of his own words or intentionally deceptious, so long as the wicked exist, that is, for ever and ever. A denial of their immortality is the only escape from this conclusion.

In respect to this word *aionion*, we further give the conclusions of one who, by his ripened scholarship and patient study of God's word, is worthy to be heard:

(1.) "It is the only word in the Greek language that fully expresses the idea of perpetual duration. Plato and other classic authors use this word for endless duration, or eternity, as distinguished from the idea of time. It denotes the ceaseless course of things."

(2.) "Jewish writers in the Greek tongue use this word for the idea of endless duration." The Seventy, in making their translation of the Old Testament for the Hellenistic Jews, have rendered the Hebrew word meaning eternity, and which is almost exclusively used to denote this attribute of Deity, by the word *aionion;* for example, Gen. xxi, 33: "And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting (*aionios*) God."

(3.) "Out of a little more than seventy passages in the New Testament in which this word is used, in upward of sixty it clearly expresses eternal duration. Many of these passages refer to the being of God; others to the happiness of the saints. This is the word, and the only single word, to express the eternity of God's existence and the eternity of the blessedness of the righteous." The proof as to the signification of the word in the verse quoted is indeed overwhelming; it can mean nothing else than unending duration.

Another passage, which there is no mistaking, is Rom. vi, 23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Death in the first clause is obviously placed in opposition to eternal life in the second. The two members of the sentence are clearly antithetical. Hence we are compelled to supply *eternal* before death. The antithesis, every rule of right interpretation, requires it. It will then read: "For the wages of sin is eternal death," etc.

The utter hopelessness of the finally condemned in their future state is a logical inference from the positive statement of Scripture that their punishment will be identical in nature and duration with that inflicted upon wicked angels, (Matt. xxv, 41): "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

We give one more passage, the reply of Jesus to Martha, the sister of Lazarus, (John xi, 26): "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die;" (literally, *shall not die forever, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,*) implying that all who did not believe in him should die forever.

How could any thing be more clearly set forth than is the eternity of the punishment of the wicked in the New Testament!

The subject we have discussed has in it, it must be confessed, nothing pleasant to contemplate. Horrors run all

(2.) "Jewish writers in the Greek tongue use this word for the idea of endless duration." The Seventy, in making their translation of the Old Testament for the Hellenistic Jews, have rendered the Hebrew word meaning eternity, and which is almost exclusively used to denote this attribute of Deity, by the word *αιώνιος*; for example, Gen. xxi, 33: "And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting (αἰώνιος) God."

(3.) "Out of a little more than seventy passages in the New Testament in which this word is used, in upward of sixty it clearly expresses eternal duration. Many of these passages refer to the being of God; others to the happiness of the saints. This is the word, and the only single word, to express the eternity of God's existence and the eternity of the blessedness of the righteous." The proof as to the signification of the word in the verse quoted is indeed overwhelming; it can mean nothing else than unending duration.

Another passage, which there is no mistaking, is Rom. vi, 23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Death in the first clause is obviously placed in opposition to eternal life in the second. The two members of the sentence are clearly antithetical. Hence we are compelled to supply *eternal* before death. The antithesis, every rule of right interpretation, requires it. It will then read: "For the wages of sin is eternal death," etc.

The utter hopelessness of the finally condemned in their future state is a logical inference from the positive statement of Scripture that their punishment will be identical in nature and duration with that inflicted upon wicked angels, (Matt. xxv. 41): "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

We give one more passage, the reply of Jesus to Martha, the sister of Lazarus, (John xi, 26): "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die;" (literally, *shall not die forever*, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,) implying that all who do not believe in him should die forever.

How could any thing be more clearly set forth than is the eternity of the punishment of the wicked in the New Testament?

The subject we have discussed has in it, it must be confessed, nothing pleasant to contemplate. Horrors rise on all through it. There is, however, little in the condition of the sinner *here*, while rejecting or neglecting the great salvation, and thus evidencing the most shocking ingratitude and impious self-sufficiency, that is pleasant to contemplate. The single feature of his case that gives relief is that divine mercy now bears with him and holds out the possibility of recovery.

Unpleasant as the subject may be, it belongs to the ministry to study it, to understand it as a part of divine revelation, and to preach it. We may add, clear and strong scriptural expositions of the subject, and earnest enforcement and appeal based upon them, such as distinguished the early Methodist preachers, were never more needed than now.

It should not be the only theme of pulpit discourse, but it should be among its themes. The certainty of future and eternal punishment should not be the only incentive presented to lead men to salvation; but it is one of many incentives; for some characters it proves the most effective, and should never be altogether passed by. Surely, it is kindness to tell dying men the fearful doom awaiting them, except they repent and be converted. It is cruelty unmeasured, immeasurable, either for fear or favor, to lift no warning voice while they are drifting away to endless woe, all the while flattering themselves with hopes which are doomed to remediless disappointment.

The doctrine of future and eternal punishment should be preached solemnly, tenderly; the whole manner of the preacher, when he presents it, should indicate the deepest compassion for souls; he should never be so ready to weep as when warning guilty men to flee the wrath to come. "Were you able to preach the doctrine *tenderly?*" said M'Cheyne to a brother minister, who spoke to him of a sermon upon endless punishment. In the treatment of such a subject, boisterous declamation, harsh denunciation, all extravagance of fancy, is nothing else than sin.

"Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." "Son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand."

ART. III.—PETER CARTWRIGHT AND PREACHING IN THE WEST.*

[FIRST ARTICLE.]

THE rapid expansion of population in America is certainly one of the most remarkable facts of contemporary history. When the barbarians overran the Western Empire in the hour of its fall, the motive which drew them toward the rich and fertile regions of Gaul, Italy, and Spain is sufficiently apparent: they were to exchange their huts for palaces, their poverty for the treasures of those who commanded the world. All the advantages, all the attractions of a superior civilization, combined to inflame their cupidity. The United States have, however, for now nearly a century, offered us the spectacle of a movement quite the reverse. Here, an irresistible impulse urges far away from the sea-coast, far from the centers of commerce and intellectual activity, a young and vigorous people; cities are abandoned for the forests, civilization for the desert. To-day the route is well trodden, and the masses of the population, ever increasing as they move westward, have already before their eyes the example and the successes of two generations. Yet how great are the obstacles and dangers which still await the emigrants! The farther they advance from the sea-coast the more sparsely populated are the regions they traverse, the poorer the roads, and the more rare and difficult to obtain are sustenance and aid.

Soon the pioneer stands face to face with solitude; he can reckon only upon himself for subsistence and security; he must find all resources in his own arm; must be himself laborer, artisan, and soldier. In the hour of danger, whether it is sickness, famine, or a hostile hand that knocks at the door, he is too distant from human ear to make his voice heard; he falls unobserved, and it is chance only that shall

---

* We published not long since in our *Quarterly* an article on Wesley and Methodism, by Remusat, an eminent French statesman, taken from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Paris. We now give an article from the same periodical on a kindred subject, nearer home. It is interesting to survey Western Methodism from such a stand-point. The numerous errors in detail we have thought it unnecessary to correct for our readers. The general views are true and striking.—ED.

reveal his misfortune or the violence he may have suffered. If at the present period not a year passes without the occurrence of some marked calamity, it is easy to understand how great must have been the peril of emigration at the close of the last century.

There was land enough every-where: Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia had not, when Ohio and Kentucky received their first colonists, the fourth of their present population; the unoccupied and arable lands which still abounded in these States invited from every direction the industry of numerous laborers; neither food nor social security were lacking.

Nevertheless, the more distant regions of the West exercised already upon the imagination so strong an attraction that thousands of families determined to abandon their homes and risk all to reach the valley of the Mississippi. For this purpose it was necessary to surmount the Alleghanies, and traverse innumerable forests which were infested by savages. Kentucky only too justly claimed its Indian name, "The Bloody Ground." This region was not the property of any particular tribe; the Indians who dwelt upon the banks of the Ohio and the Tennessee looked upon it as a sort of neutral territory, as an immense reserve, where they were privileged to hunt their game, and from which they were determined to exclude every stranger. Therefore they resisted with fury the encroachments of the Americans. There was then no road through the woods; hardly was a narrow path found, utterly impracticable for wheels. The emigrants carried all their movables upon horseback. Single families did not make the venture alone, but caravans were formed and guides were taken, young and vigorous men who were well accustomed to the hardships of the way, familiar with the region, and good marksmen. One could not then pass a day's journey in the woods without finding some scalped corpse; while in one place and another a commemorative name of sinister import, as "Camp Defeat," recalled some act of frightful butchery.

When the father of Peter Cartwright left Virginia for Kentucky, in 1790, he joined one of these caravans, numbering one hundred families, every man of them carrying a gun, while they had also an armed escort of a hundred men. The company, despite their numbers, were constantly harassed by reveal his misfortune or the violence he may have suffered. If at the present period not a year passes without the occurrence of some marked calamity, it is easy to understand how great must have been the peril of emigration at the close of the last century.

There was land enough every-where: Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia had not, when Ohio and Kentucky received their first colonists, the fourth of their present population; the unoccupied and arable lands which still abounded in these States invited from every direction the industry of numerous laborers; neither food nor social security were lacking. Nevertheless, the more distant regions of the West exercised already upon the imagination so strong an attraction that thousands of families determined to abandon their homes and risk all to reach the valley of the Mississippi. For this purpose it was necessary to surmount the Alleghanies, and traverse innumerable forests which were infested by savages. Kentucky only too justly claimed its Indian name, "The Bloody Ground." This region was not the property of any particular tribe; the Indians who dwelt upon the banks of the Ohio and the Tennessee looked upon it as a sort of neutral territory, as an immense reserve, where they were privileged to hunt their game, and from which they were determined to exclude every stranger. Therefore they resisted with fury the encroachments of the Americans. There was then no road through the woods; hardly was a narrow path found, utterly impracticable for wheels. The emigrants carried all their movables upon horseback. Single families did not make the venture alone, but caravans were formed and guides were taken, young and vigorous men who were well accustomed to the hardships of the way, familiar with the region, and good marksmen. One could not then pass a day's journey in the woods without finding some scalped corpse; while in one place and another a commemorative name of sinister import, as "Camp Defeat," recalled some act of frightful butchery.

When the father of Peter Cartwright left Virginia for Kentucky, in 1790, he joined one of these caravans, numbering one hundred families, every man of them carrying a gun, while they had also an armed escort of a hundred men. The company, despite their numbers, were constantly harassed by the Indians. After a march of several days, the night fell upon them seven miles from Crab Orchard, which was the first American settlement within the limits of Kentucky and enjoyed the protection of a fort. The emigrants determined to press on, and take no rest till they should find security at the settlement. Seven families, however, overcome by fatigue or satisfied with the safety of their position, preferred to remain and encamp on the spot. They were attacked during the night and all massacred, with the exception of one man, who fled, half naked, and reported at the fort the sad event. Volunteers immediately set out on horseback, and hastened to overtake the savages at the point where they usually crossed the Ohio; there they laid an ambuscade and slew the greater part of the Indians, recovering from them the spoils of the massacred emigrants.

Such were every-day occurrences, and the earlier annals of Kentucky abound in accounts of like horrors. And yet the relentless hostility of the Indians was not the only danger which we have to notice. Not all the colonists were drawn westward by the fertility or cheapness of the land. Certain ardent and adventurous characters were seen among them, undisciplined spirits who could endure no check, who sought in the wilderness release from all control, whether the conventionalities or obligations of society. Besides these, whoever might be in any way amenable to justice would seek impunity by emigration to the West, and such characters brought a yet more dangerous element into the rude and turbulent community, which, by its habituation to arms and the chase, was already sufficiently predisposed to acts of violence. Force alone could establish order and security. Hear upon this subject the testimony of an eye-witness:

> Logan County, when my father moved to it, was called "Rogues' Harbor." Here many refugees, from almost all parts of the Union, fled to escape justice or punishment; for although there was law, yet it could not be executed, and it was a desperate state of society. Murderers, horse thieves, highway robbers, and counterfeiters, fled here, until they combined and actually formed a majority. The honest and civil part of the citizens would prosecute these wretched banditti, but they would swear each other clear; and they really put all law at defiance, and carried on such desperate violence and outrage that the honest part

the Indians. After a march of several days, the night fell upon them seven miles from Crab Orchard, which was the first American settlement within the limits of Kentucky and enjoyed the protection of a fort. The emigrants determined to press on, and take no rest till they should find security at the settlement. Seven families, however, overcome by fatigue or satisfied with the safety of their position, preferred to remain and encamp on the spot. They were attacked during the night and all massacred, with the exception of one man, who fled, half naked, and reported at the fort the sad event. Volunteers immediately set out on horseback, and hastened to overtake the savages at the point where they usually crossed the Ohio; there they laid an ambuscade and slew the greater part of the Indians, recovering from them the spoils of the massacred emigrants.

Such were every-day occurrences, and the earlier annals of Kentucky abound in accounts of like horrors. And yet the relentless hostility of the Indians was not the only danger which we have to notice. Not all the colonists were drawn westward by the fertility or cheapness of the land. Certain ardent and adventurous characters were seen among them, undisciplined spirits who could endure no check, who sought in the wilderness release from all control, whether the conventionalities or obligations of society. Besides these, whoever might be in any way amenable to justice would seek impunity by emigration to the West, and such characters brought a yet more dangerous element into the rude and turbulent community, which, by its habituation to arms and the chase, was already sufficiently predisposed to acts of violence. Force alone could establish order and security. Hear upon this subject the testimony of an eye-witness:

> Logan County, when my father moved to it, was called "Rogues' Harbor." Here many refugees, from almost all parts of the Union, fled to escape justice or punishment; for although there was law, yet it could not be executed, and it was a desperate state of society. Murderers, horse thieves, highway robbers, and counterfeiters, fled here, until they combined and actually formed a majority. The honest and civil part of the citizens would prosecute these wretched banditti, but they would swear each other clear; and they really put all law at defiance, and carried on such desperate violence and outrage that the honest part

of the citizens seemed to be driven to the necessity of uniting and combining together, and taking the law into their own hands, under the name of Regulators. This was a very desperate state of things.

Shortly after the Regulators had formed themselves into a society, and established their code of by-laws, on a court day at Russellville the two bands met in town. Soon a quarrel commenced, and a general battle ensued between the rogues and Regulators, and they fought with guns, pistols, dirks, knives, and clubs. Some were actually killed, many wounded; the rogues proved victors, kept the ground, and drove the Regulators out of town. The Regulators rallied again, hunted, killed, and lynched many of the rogues, until several of them fled, and left for parts unknown. Many lives were lost on both sides, to the great scandal of civilized people. This is but a partial view of frontier life.

The existence of those early Western colonists, as illustrated also by that of the emigrants in our day, was a succession of privations. Game was the staple of their nourishment, and often, like the savages, they broiled upon the coals the deer but half skinned. They broke their corn and grain in a mortar, and had for drink a decoction of sage, sassafras, and other odoriferous herbs, which they sweetened with maple sugar. They planted flax, steeped and broke it themselves; they cleaned by hand the cotton which they raised, while the women carded, spun, and wove the linen and cotton to make out of the coarse stuff they had thus manufactured their husbands' garments. As to the thousand superfluities which are the most clamorous wants of civilized nations, these were entirely disregarded. The noted evangelist, who appears to personify the most brilliant era of Western preaching, Peter Cartwright, was ten years old before he had seen coffee. In process of time, however, one of his father's neighbors learned that the American Government had established at Fort Messick, on the bank of the Ohio, a depot of groceries and household articles, and had authorized exchanges with the pioneers. He at once cut down an enormous poplar, hollowed out its trunk to form a canoe, and in this improvised vessel undertook to descend the Red River, then the Cumberland, and then to ascend the Ohio as far as the fort. Each one gave to his charge whatever he might have for sale, or a little money, with a list of the articles desired in return. The voyage succeeded well, and it was the subject of interest for a long time in Kentucky.

Nothing came to disturb the monotony of ordinary life. In the fine season the men journeyed long distances on Sunday to meet together for the chase or for fishing. They improvised horse-races, played cards, and, if women were in their company, formed dances. Amid the pleasures and necessities of a material life, intellectual and moral wants received little attention. Very few of the emigrants possessed books, and little time had they to read. Only a high degree of natural intelligence and a strong purpose could have reserved from the cares of each day room for soul-culture. Minds become dormant from want of exercise revolted at a demand for effort. Even sentiments of religion, however deeply they strike root by nature in the human heart, yet grew feeble and inactive in the depths of the forest, where the word of God was seldom heard. Religious services of whatever form, whether public prayer or preaching, were but rarely enjoyed; often were the dead laid in their earthly resting-place with none to say a word of farewell or offer consolation to the survivors. Years rolled away before children could be baptized: they grew up receiving no instruction except such as might be afforded by their parents, who were themselves ignorant and blind, attached only to earthly pursuits, and with the most imperfect notions of the Deity. Credulity prevailed generally among the pioneers; they were exposed to all manner of superstition and error. With some scraps of ill-digested knowledge, a certain facility in speech and in captious argument, one might easily pass for a man of superior wisdom with these backwoods settlers, and persuade them to almost any belief. There were not wanting impostors to seize upon these advantages, and the most vulgar devices, the grossest artifices, enabled such persons to secure with their dupes an irresistible prestige. Let us hear a Methodist preacher give an account of a contest he sustained with one of these impostors:

> There was here in Marietta a preacher by the name of A. Sargent; he had been a Universalist preacher, but finding such a motley gang as I have above mentioned, he thought (and thought correctly, too) that they were proper subjects for his imposture. Accordingly, he assumed the name of Halcyon Church, and proclaimed himself the millennial messenger. He professed to see visions, fall into trances, and to converse with angels. His followers were numerous in the town and country.

Nothing came to disturb the monotony of ordinary life. In the fine season the men journeyed long distances on Sunday to meet together for the chase or for fishing. They improvised horse-races, played cards, and, if women were in their company, formed dances. Amid the pleasures and necessities of a material life, intellectual and moral wants received little attention. Very few of the emigrants possessed books, and little time had they to read. Only a high degree of natural intelligence and a strong purpose could have reserved from the cares of each day room for soul-culture. Minds become dormant from want of exercise forcibly called for by a demand for effort. Even sentiments of religion, however deeply they strike root by nature in the human heart, yet grew feeble and inactive in the depths of the forest, where the word of God was seldom heard. Religious services of whatever form, whether public prayer or preaching, were but rarely enjoyed; often were the dead laid in their earthly resting-place with none to say a word of farewell or offer consolation to the survivors. Years rolled away before children could be baptized: they grew up receiving no instruction except such as might be afforded by their parents, who were themselves ignorant and blind, attached only to earthly pursuits, and with the most imperfect notions of the Deity. Credulity prevailed generally among the pioneers; they were exposed to all manner of superstition and error. With some scraps of ill-digested knowledge, a certain facility in speech and in captious argument, one might easily pass for a man of superior wisdom with these backwoods settlers, and persuade them to almost any belief. There were not wanting impostors to seize upon these advantages, and the most vulgar devices, the grossest artifices, enabled such persons to secure with their dupes an irresistible prestige. Let us hear a Methodist preacher give an account of a contest he sustained with one of these impostors:

There was here in Marietta a preacher by the name of *A. Sargent*; he had been a Universalist preacher, but finding such a motley gang as I have above mentioned, he thought (and thought correctly, too) that they were proper subjects for his imposture. Accordingly, he assumed the name of Halcyon Church, and proclaimed himself the millennial messenger. He professed to see visions, fall into trances, and to converse with angels. His followers were numerous in the town and country.

The Presbyterian and Congregational ministers were afraid of him. He had men preachers and women preachers. The Methodists had no meeting-house in Marietta. We had to preach in the court-house when we could get a chance. We battled pretty severely. The Congregationalists opened their academy for me to preach in. I prepared myself, and gave battle to the Halcyons. This made a mighty commotion. In the mean time we had a camp-meeting in the suburbs of Marietta. Brother Sale, our presiding elder, was there. Mr. Sargent came, and hung around and wanted to preach; but Brother Sale never noticed him. I have said before that he professed to go into trances and have visions. He would swoon away, fall, and lay a long time; and when he would come to he would tell what mighty things he had seen and heard.

On Sunday night, at our camp-meeting, Sargent got some powder, lit a cigar, and then walked down to the bank of the river, one hundred yards, where stood a large stump. He put his powder on the stump and touched it with his cigar. The flash of the powder was seen by many at the camp, at least the light. When the powder flashed, down fell Sargent: there he lay a good while. In the mean time the people found him lying there and gathered around him. At length he came to, and said he had a message from God to us Methodists. He said God had come down to him in a flash of light, and he fell under the power of God, and thus received his vision.

Seeing so many gathered around him there, I took a light and went down to see what was going on. As soon as I came near the stump I smelled the sulphur of the powder; and, stepping up to the stump, there was clearly the sign of powder, and hard by lay the cigar with which he had ignited it. He was now busy delivering his message. I stepped up to him and asked him if an angel had appeared to him in that flash of light.

He said, "Yes."

Said I, "Sargent, did not that angel smell of brimstone?"

"Why," said he, "do you ask me such a foolish question?"

"Because," said I, "if an angel has spoken to you at all, he was from the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone!" and raising my voice, I said, "I smell sulphur now!" I walked up to the stump, and called on the people to come and see for themselves. The people rushed up, and soon saw through the trick, and began to abuse Sargent for a vile impostor. He soon left, and we were troubled no more with him or his brimstone angels.

Another anecdote will further show the ignorance and excessive simplicity of these Western emigrants, who lacked often the first elements of Christian knowledge. It will show how the most *bizarre* errors and the most senseless doctrines could find credit with them:

Mr. Lee was once preaching in a private house. He had taken for his text: "Except a man deny himself, and take up his cross, he cannot be my disciple." He urged on his congregation, with melting voice and tearful eyes, to take up the cross; no matter what it was, take it up.

There were in the congregation a very wicked Dutchman and his wife, both of whom were profoundly ignorant of the Scriptures and the plan of salvation. His wife was a notorious scold, and so much was she given to this practice that she made her husband unhappy, and kept him almost always in a perfect fret, so that he led a most miserable and uncomfortable life. It pleased God that day to cause the preaching of Mr. Lee to reach their guilty souls and break up the great deep of their hearts. They wept aloud, seeing their lost condition, and they, then and there, resolved to do better, and from that time forward to take up the cross and bear it, be it what it might.

The congregation were generally deeply affected. Mr. Lee exhorted them, and prayed for them as long as he consistently could; and, having another appointment some distance off that evening, he dismissed the congregation, got a little refreshment, saddled his horse, mounted, and started for his evening appointment. After riding some distance he saw, a little ahead of him, a man trudging along carrying a woman on his back. This greatly surprised Mr. Lee. He very naturally supposed that the woman was a cripple, or had hurt herself in some way, so that she could not walk. The traveler was a small man, and the woman large and heavy.

Before he overtook them Mr. Lee began to cast about in his mind how he could render them assistance. When he came up to them, lo and behold! who should it be but the Dutchman and his wife that had been so affected under his sermon at meeting. Mr. Lee rode up and spoke to them, and inquired of the man what had happened, or what was the matter, that he was carrying his wife.

The Dutchman turned to Mr. Lee and said, "Besure you did tell us in your sarmon dat we must take up de cross and follow de Saviour, or dat we could not be saved or go to heaven, and I does desire to go to heaven so much as any pody; and dish vife is so pad, she scold and scold all de time, and dish woman is de createst cross I have in de whole world, and I does take her up and pare her, for I must save my soul."

You may be sure that Mr. Lee was posed for once, but after a few moments' reflection he told the Dutchman to put his wife down, and he dismounted from his horse. He directed them to sit down on a log by the roadside. He held the reins of his horse's bridle, and sat down by them, took out his Bible, read to them several passages of Scripture, and explained and expounded to them the way of the Lord more perfectly. He opened to them the nature of the cross of Christ, what it is, how it is to be taken up, and how they were to bear that cross; and after teaching

Mr. Lee was once preaching in a private house. He had taken for his text: "Except a man deny himself, and take up his cross, he cannot be my disciple." He urged on his congregation, with melting voice and tearful eyes, to take up the cross; no matter what it was, take it up.

There were in the congregation a very wicked Dutchman and his wife, both of whom were profoundly ignorant of the Scriptures and the plan of salvation. His wife was a notorious scold, and so much was she given to this practice that she made her husband unhappy, and kept him almost always in a perfect fret, so that he led a most miserable and uncomfortable life. It pleased God that day to cause the preaching of Mr. Lee to reach their guilty souls and break up the great deep of their hearts. They wept aloud, seeing their lost condition, and they, then and there, resolved to do better, and from that time forward to take up the cross and bear it, be it what it might.

The congregation were generally deeply affected. Mr. Lee exhorted them, and prayed for them as long as he consistently could; and, having another appointment some distance off that evening, he dismissed the congregation, got a little refreshment, saddled his horse, mounted, and started for his evening appointment. After riding some distance he saw, a little ahead of him, a man trudging along carrying a woman on his back. This greatly surprised Mr. Lee. He very naturally supposed that the woman was a cripple, or had hurt herself in some way, so that she could not walk. The traveler was a small man, and the woman large and heavy.

Before he overtook them Mr. Lee began to cast about in his mind how he could render them assistance. When he came up to them, lo and behold! who should it be but the Dutchman and his wife that had been so affected under his sermon at meeting. Mr. Lee rode up and spoke to them, and inquired of the man what had happened, or what was the matter, that he was carrying his wife.

The Dutchman turned to Mr. Lee and said, "Besure you did tell us in your sarmon dat we must take up de cross and follow de Saviour, or dat we could not be saved or go to heaven, and I does desire to go to heaven so much as any pody; and dish vife is so pad, she scold and scold all de time, and dish woman is de greatest cross I have in de whole world, and I does take her up and pare her, for I must save my soul."

You may be sure that Mr. Lee was posed for once, but after a few moments' reflection he told the Dutchman to put his wife down, and he dismounted from his horse. He directed them to sit down on a log by the roadside. He held the reins of his horse's bridle, and sat down by them, took out his little Bible, read to them several passages of Scripture, and explained and expounded to them the way of the Lord more perfectly. He opened to them the nature of the cross of Christ, what it is, how it is to be taken up, and how they were to bear that cross; and after teaching and advising them some time, he prayed for them by the roadside, left them deeply affected, mounted his horse, and rode on to his evening appointment.

The young and unformed community could not have continued long in such a state of ignorance without falling into utter barbarism. Then the presence of certain actively-evil elements, which, in a manner above indicated, had found their way here, put it in like peril. It is true, the human spirit may claim for itself an inward energy capable of rising to the perception and observance of the eternal laws of morality; but such an attainment is only the result of wise culture for the masses, or is a special endowment of certain privileged natures. The most ambitious philosophy, even when it pretends to be the sole guide and aid for the conduct of life, can only claim the control of certain elect souls, and confesses its inability to save the majority of mankind. However natural and vital be the instincts of men for the just and the good, yet the clearest conceptions of moral truth cannot escape obscuration and extinction unless the sentiment of religion is present to bring the human creature into the presence of his Creator, that he may thus be mindful of his origin and dependence, and that the eternal connection between virtue and its reward, iniquity and its punishment, may be ever before his eyes. Not only was the recognition of God and of his claims needed among these untrained people as a social safeguard, but there must be nourishment for the individual soul, which is elevated and strengthened by instruction in the sublime verities of religion. Was it sufficient to save these poor settlers from the indulgence of coarse passions? Did they not also need amid the pressure of numerous physical wants the counterpoise of higher considerations to detach their affections from earth, and their thoughts from the dominion of a gross materialism? And whence might come to the Western pioneers such indispensable instruction? Lost in the depth of the wilderness, isolated from one another, separated from civilized institutions by distance, and still more by the perils of the journey, from whom might they expect to hear the Divine word? Who would become the shepherd of this wandering flock? Who would undertake to lead back to God, one by one, these abandoned sheep? Little could be expected of the colonial

clergy, who were none too numerous for their immediate duties. In New England the Puritan Church had lost all spirit of proselytism; alarmed by the divisions which were developing in its own bosom, it was exhausting itself in efforts to preserve a factitious unity. In Virginia and in the Southern colonies, the Anglican clergy, abundantly supported by the liberality of the early colonists, led a peaceful life, visited the estates of the wealthy, and paid very little regard to the *poor whites* who each year left the Atlantic coast to press beyond the Alleghanies into the Western solitudes.

No religious and moral culture, spiritual counsel or formal worship, would have been for a long time enjoyed in the Mississippi valley had there not, at the very moment when the westward emigration began, also occurred a reform movement within the Anglican Church. The Freethinkers of the eighteenth century in France were preceded by the Freethinkers of England. The age of Queen Anne was the age of wits and infidels. The Puritan fanaticism, which had so profoundly agitated England, could only survive under persecution; it had lost all force, like an unbent spring, and the power of ridicule had deprived it of all its former influence. The Anglican clergy, no longer stimulated by the ardor or dangers of the conflict, relieved of inquietude both from the side of Papists and Republicans, were now occupied far more with politics and literature than with theology. The welfare of souls was their least care; well endowed, full of the world and of philosophy, they followed the bent of the age, and were of two classes: the younger sons of the nobility, assured by their birth of attaining honorable stations and rich sinecures, and pensioners of the University, whose sole ambition was to find *entrée* to the society of some influential patron as the means of securing a benefice. The higher classes of society had been seduced to infidelity by the corruption of morals, the middle classes by bad example, and the mass through neglect, ignorance, and the absence of all religious instruction.

At this point of religious destitution a reformer arose. John Wesley belonged to a clerical family: he was both son and grandson of English clergymen distinguished for their literary labors. He himself was early known for the fervor of his religious faith and the severity of his manners. While only a clergy, who were none too numerous for their immediate duties. In New England the Puritan Church had lost all spirit of proselytism; alarmed by the divisions which were developing in its own bosom, it was exhausting itself in efforts to preserve a factitious unity. In Virginia and in the Southern colonies, the Anglican clergy, abundantly supported by the liberality of the early colonists, led a peaceful life, visited the estates of the wealthy, and paid very little regard to the poor whites who each year left the Atlantic coast to press beyond the Alleghanies into the Western solitudes.

No religious and moral culture, spiritual counsel or formal worship, would have been for a long time enjoyed in the Mississippi valley had there not, at the very moment when the westward emigration began, also occurred a reform movement within the Anglican Church. The Freethinkers of the eighteenth century in France were preceded by the Freethinkers of England. The age of Queen Anne was the age of wits and infidels. The Puritan fanaticism, which had so profoundly agitated England, could only survive under persecution; it had lost all force, like an unbent spring, and the power of ridicule had deprived it of all its former influence. The Anglican clergy, no longer stimulated by the ardor or dangers of the conflict, relieved of inquietude both from the side of Papists and Republicans, were now occupied far more with politics and literature than with theology. The welfare of souls was their least care; well endowed, full of the world and of philosophy, they followed the bent of the age, and were of two classes: the younger sons of the nobility, assured by their birth of attaining honorable stations and rich sinecures, and pensioners of the University, whose sole ambition was to find entrée to the society of some influential patron as the means of securing a benefice. The higher classes of society had been seduced to infidelity by the corruption of morals, the middle classes by bad example, and the mass through neglect, ignorance, and the absence of all religious instruction.

At this point of religious destitution a reformer arose. John Wesley belonged to a clerical family; he was both son and grandson of English clergymen distinguished for their literary labors. He himself was early known for the fervor of his religious faith and the severity of his manners. While only a student at Oxford he formed with some of his fellow-pupils, who were brought together by his example, a small society; they met to pray together, applied themselves to works of charity, and agreed to observe every day, at the same hours, the same exercises of devotion; they renounced dancing, card-playing, and all the worldly amusements so much enjoyed at Oxford. These associates were named, in derision, by the other students, *Methodists.* On leaving the University John Wesley believed himself called upon to carry the Gospel to the Indians, and set out for America; but at the end of two years he returned to England, and resolved to pursue his vocation among his fellow-countrymen.

It was no question of doctrine which engaged his attention. Brought up in the Church of England, he held, at least in the beginning of his career, to all its dogmas. He was grieved to behold the general corruption of morals, the indifference which pervaded every soul, the apathy and powerlessness of the clergy. Why was the Church, notwithstanding its immense resources, thus stricken with sterility, making no aggression, and devoid of inward life? Why was the clergy so wealthy, so cultured and learned, yet devoid of power with the masses? Since the doctrine remained pure, such paralysis in the Church must result from some defect of organization; some element of connection was wanting, by absence of which the clergy and their flock, priest and laymen, were prevented from acting effectively upon each other. Like all reformers, Wesley applied himself, first of all, to the study of earlier times, and would return to primitive Christianity; he asked himself how the faith was so rapidly propagated, and how the zeal and fervor of the primitive Church was sustained. Two forms of preaching had simultaneously co-operated, as it appeared to him, to produce the effect: that of the apostles, who had received Divine authority, and that of simple evangelists; that is, of private Christians who felt themselves called upon to preach the Gospel, and whose zeal made them every-where the precursors and auxiliaries of the apostles. The Church, then, had really been mutilated; one of the two sources of a sustained faith had been shut up in confining to the clergy alone the right to preach. The clergy must, indeed, be the depository of doctrine; but why forbid the co-operation of the

laity in the propagation of the Gospel? Why refuse the assistance of pious souls who, filled with holy ardor, feel themselves summoned to strengthen and revive the faith of their brethren? The required reformation demanded no rupture with the English Church, nor indeed any change in the establishment; it was only necessary to supply its lack by adding to the instructions of the clergy the aid and stimulus which would proceed from lay preaching.

It is no part of our present purpose to trace the progress of Methodism in England. It was rapid. In the midst of his successes Wesley never lost sight of America, which had seen the first efforts of his ministry.

Just at the opening of the struggle between the colonists and the mother country, at the moment when the first emigrants were entering the limits of Kentucky and Ohio, he sent across the Atlantic certain chosen preachers. Already some of his followers had passed the sea, and had begun the work of proselytism in the principal maritime cities; but Methodism could not migrate without undergoing some change. Wesley had expressly enjoined upon his preachers to regard themselves solely as assistants of the clergy, to confine themselves to preaching, and in no way to interfere with priestly functions. They might not even baptize infants, except in danger of death; but they must for all ceremonies of worship and administration of the sacraments look to the regularly established ministers of the Church. Nothing was easier than this in England. But the case was quite otherwise in the colonies, where the English clergy were few in number; and in the interior, far from the towns, it was impossible to observe such a rule. A population destitute of spiritual institutions had certainly the greatest need of preaching, and to such a field the Methodist preachers were impelled by a genuine Gospel zeal and by good hope of success. Here they found every day the dead to be buried, an infant to be baptized, a marriage to be consummated, under circumstances where it was impossible to summon a minister; besides, they could not resist the earnestly expressed desires of the people, and the assumption by the laity of all clerical functions became an absolute necessity of the situation. The War of Independence raised another barrier between English Methodism and the body of its adherents laity in the propagation of the Gospel? Why refuse the assistance of pious souls who, filled with holy ardor, feel themselves summoned to strengthen and revive the faith of their brethren? The required reformation demanded no rupture with the English Church, nor indeed any change in the establishment; it was only necessary to supply its lack by adding to the instructions of the clergy the aid and stimulus which would proceed from lay preaching.

It is no part of our present purpose to trace the progress of Methodism in England. It was rapid. In the midst of his successes Wesley never lost sight of America, which had seen the first efforts of his ministry.

Just at the opening of the struggle between the colonists and the mother country, at the moment when the first emigrants were entering the limits of Kentucky and Ohio, he sent across the Atlantic certain chosen preachers. Already some of his followers had passed the sea, and had begun the work of proselytism in the principal maritime cities; but Methodism could not migrate without undergoing some change. Wesley had expressly enjoined upon his preachers to regard themselves solely as assistants of the clergy, to confine themselves to preaching, and in no way to interfere with priestly functions. They might not even baptize infants, except in danger of death; but they must for all ceremonies of worship and administration of the sacraments look to the regularly established ministers of the Church. Nothing was easier than this in England. But the case was quite otherwise in the colonies, where the English clergy were few in number; and in the interior, far from the towns, it was impossible to observe such a rule. A population destitute of spiritual institutions had certainly the greatest need of preaching, and to such a field the Methodist preachers were impelled by a genuine Gospel zeal and by good hope of success. Here they found every day the dead to be buried, an infant to be baptized, a marriage to be consummated, under circumstances where it was impossible to summon a minister; besides, they could not resist the earnestly expressed desires of the people, and the assumption by the laity of all clerical functions became an absolute necessity of the situation. The War of Independence raised another barrier between English Methodism and the body of its adherents in America. The preachers sent out by Wesley were Englishmen, and open in advance to the suspicions of the colonists. Partaking themselves the opinion of their master on the matter of the revolt, they were generally hostile to the cause of Independence, and exerted against it the influence which they possessed, refusing themselves to swear obedience to the newly-established authorities and inciting others to do the same. This was sufficient to awaken against them popular indignation, provoked and stimulated as this also was by the jealousy and denunciations of the American clergy. Some of them were imprisoned, some changed their course, others fled for safety to the woods. This very persecution, of short duration, served to incite a special zeal in proselytism, courage, and other virtues, which drew many adherents to the cause of Methodism.

When independence was finally gained there was no longer occasion for opposition on the part of the preachers. The greater number of them returned, however, to England, following the example of many clergymen of the English Church. The latter ceased to be in America a State Church. It had no longer a recognized hierarchy, and its only revenues now were the voluntary contributions of its adherents. Nearly all its ministers preferred returning to the old country, where a career to which they were accustomed still remained for them. To join the destinies of Methodism to the fortunes of a Church which was now subjected by the change of circumstances to a necessary declension; to oblige a young and vigorous nation, jealous of its independence, to borrow from a distant land, thenceforth foreign, and perhaps hostile, its ecclesiastical establishment, its clergy and spiritual instruction; to maintain the formal ties of religion after those of national life were sundered —this was to strangle in its birth the work just begun. Wesley was the first to perceive this, and, renouncing at once the authority he had hitherto exercised over the Methodists in America, he allowed them to organize themselves as an independent Church. He sent to the United States in 1784, for the superintendence of the work, a man who enjoyed in a special degree his confidence, Dr. Coke, and joined to him as assistant the most popular of the preachers then in America, Francis Asbury. An assembly of the preachers was convened

at Baltimore on Christmas, and sixty out of the eighty-six were present.* Asbury, although by birth an Englishman, refused to accept the authorization of Wesley, unless this were confirmed by the free choice of his associates. This conference, following the designation of Wesley, elected Coke and Asbury jointly to the position of superintendents or bishops, and chose immediately out of its own number, by a majority vote, twelve preachers, who received the title of elders. These were to administer the sacraments and exercise a certain direction over their colleagues. The conference, at the same time, adopted as a symbol of faith twenty-five *Articles of Religion*, prepared by Wesley, and which were but an abridgment of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English creed. The establishment of the new order of clergy, the government of the Church, the determination of the form of doctrine, all depended thenceforth upon votes of the conference, and the votes had for their basis universal suffrage [of the clergy.] It were impossible to model the religious community more perfectly in accordance with the civil order.

Let us try to make clear as to its details the organization of the Methodist Church. As soon as in any locality the number of its adherents may reach ten or twelve, they are formed into a class with a *leader* at its head. The class is to meet once a week for united prayer, and it is the duty of the leader to visit at least once a week each member of his class, to be informed of the state of his soul, and to strengthen him in the faith. The number in the class must never exceed twenty, and when the increase is beyond that point subdivision takes place. When several classes have been formed in one locality or near neighborhood they seek to form a society and secure a church, where they may regularly worship on the Sabbath. The conduct of the services and the preaching is undertaken, almost always gratuitously, by a local preacher, chosen by the class-leaders from the members, in view of his especial fitness for these duties, and regularly authorized. In defect of a preacher, some one of the members who seems to have a calling, and some facility in speaking, assumes this work under the name of *exhorter*. Only the ministry of the sacraments—and this is the peculiar at Baltimore on Christmas, and sixty out of the eighty-six were present.* Asbury, although by birth an Englishman, refused to accept the authorization of Wesley, unless this were confirmed by the free choice of his associates. This conference, following the designation of Wesley, elected Coke and Asbury jointly to the position of superintendents or bishops, and chose immediately out of its own number, by a majority vote, twelve preachers, who received the title of elders. These were to administer the sacraments and exercise a certain direction over their colleagues. The conference, at the same time, adopted as a symbol of faith twenty-five *Articles of Religion*, prepared by Wesley, and which were but an abridgment of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English creed. The establishment of the new order of clergy, the government of the Church, the determination of the form of doctrine, all depended thenceforth upon votes of the conference, and the votes had for their basis universal suffrage [of the clergy.] It were impossible to model the religious community more perfectly in accordance with the civil order.

---

* According to Stevens's History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the whole number of preachers at this time was eighty-one.—Tr.

Let us try to make clear as to its details the organization of the Methodist Church. As soon as in any locality the number of its adherents may reach ten or twelve, they are formed into a class with a *leader* at its head. The class is to meet once a week for united prayer, and it is the duty of the leader to visit at least once a week each member of his class, to be informed of the state of his soul, and to strengthen him in the faith. The number in the class must never exceed twenty, and when the increase is beyond that point subdivision takes place. When several classes have been formed in one locality or near neighborhood they seek to form a society and secure a church, where they may regularly worship on the Sabbath. The conduct of the services and the preaching is undertaken, almost always gratuitously, by a local preacher, chosen by the class-leaders from the members, in view of his especial fitness for these duties, and regularly authorized. In defect of a preacher, some one of the members who seems to have a calling, and some facility in speaking, assumes this work under the name of *exhorter*. Only the ministry of the sacraments—and this is the peculiar trait of American Methodism—pertains exclusively to the evangelist or traveling preacher, who is charged with the message of the Gospel within a given precinct called a *circuit*, and to whom the local preacher is but an assistant. It is he who appoints the class-leaders, and who gives preaching licenses to the exhorters. He directs the ceremonies of the worship wherever he is present, and confers upon the converts whose life is satisfactory the title of church member. The traveling preacher consecrates himself entirely to the ministry, and for his support is dependent upon the circuit. He is at first, however, but a layman, and he must preach for two years, and follow certain studies, to receive the order of deacon. Two more years of preaching and study admit him to a higher order, and allow him to be constituted an elder. The deacon, whose diploma must be signed by a bishop, has authority not only to preach, but to baptize children, to perform marriages, and, in the administration of the Supper, to assist the elders, who alone have power to consecrate the communion.

---

* According to Stevens's History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the whole number of preachers at this time was eighty-one.—Tr.

Several circuits make a district, at the head of which is a Presiding Elder. The duty of these elders is to visit each circuit at least once a quarter to preach and administer the sacraments; at the same time they assemble preachers, traveling and local, to consider with them the spiritual wants of the circuit, to deliver licenses to new preachers who may be recommended by the societies, and to hear any complaints against such as may be already in exercise of that office. Several districts form a Conference, the superintendence of which belongs to a Bishop. He must constantly travel in his circumscription, and he presides every year over a conference composed of all the presiding elders and all the elders of his charge, and of two preachers from each district. This conference exercises a disciplinary power upon all the members within its bounds; it appoints the presiding elders, and assigns the preachers to their circuits, who may not preach to the same people more than two consecutive years. The bishops and delegates elected by such conference form a general assembly, which meets every four years, and is the supreme power, since it elects and controls the bishops, and pronounces in the last resort upon all questions of discipline; while it can, within certain restrictions, modify the doctrine, rules, and constitution of the Church.

Such in its essential features is the organization of the American Methodist Church, a studied and complicated organization which did not spring from the brain of one man nor arise in a moment, but is the product of time and experience. It was developed and perfected as each new want appeared, and so has satisfied nearly all the needs of a society placed in conditions entirely different from those of the old world. Faithful to the principle set forth by Wesley, American Methodism seeks to combine the efforts of individual zeal with the regular action of the clergy, who themselves are constantly incited by the incessant oversight of the presiding elders and bishops.

The flexible organization of this Church permits it to follow in its most rapid progress a community whose expansive movements never cease. As fast as civilization overspreads the wilderness, and the circle of active life is enlarged, the Methodist circuit is transformed into a district, the district into a conference, and in such a way that the preachers never find themselves overburdened, and the control of the organization remains ever vigorous. The constitution of the class provides at the same time the means of following the emigrant into the very depths of the forest. The peculiarity of Methodism—and here lies the secret of its spread—is, that it never leaves the Christian man to himself, abandoned of spiritual aid. If the preacher be wanting, the most isolated believer is sure to find counsel, encouragement, or consolation from the exhorter or the class leader. At the same time that the wisely-constituted organization of Methodism enables it to reach to the extreme limits of civilization, it also embraces, as not all the American sects do, the lowest classes within its fold; it does not leave the Negro without Christian culture, and sends its Missions also to the Indians.

II. The introduction of Methodism into America, and the commencement of the western emigration, were two contemporary facts. The details to which we have just given attention readily make it apparent how well the Methodist Church was from its origin suited to meet the spiritual wants of the emigrants; it alone was so organized as to be able to follow step by step this movable population, and to carry the Gospel even to the most distant cabin. It alone could be present

Such in its essential features is the organization of the American Methodist Church, a studied and complicated organization which did not spring from the brain of one man nor arise in a moment, but is the product of time and experience. It was developed and perfected as each new want appeared, and so has satisfied nearly all the needs of a society placed in conditions entirely different from those of the old world. Faithful to the principle set forth by Wesley, American Methodism seeks to combine the efforts of individual zeal with the regular action of the clergy, who themselves are constantly incited by the incessant oversight of the presiding elders and bishops.

The flexible organization of this Church permits it to follow in its most rapid progress a community whose expansive movements never cease. As fast as civilization overspreads the wilderness, and the circle of active life is enlarged, the Methodist circuit is transformed into a district, the district into a conference, and in such a way that the preachers never find themselves overburdened, and the control of the organization remains ever vigorous. The constitution of the class provides at the same time the means of following the emigrant into the very depths of the forest. The peculiarity of Methodism—and here lies the secret of its spread—is, that it never leaves the Christian man to himself, abandoned of spiritual aid. If the preacher be wanting, the most isolated believer is sure to find counsel, encouragement, or consolation from the exhorter or the class-leader. At the same time that the wisely-constituted organization of Methodism enables it to reach to the extreme limits of civilization, it also embraces, as not all the American sects do, the lowest classes within its fold; it does not leave the Negro without Christian culture, and sends its Missions also to the Indians.

II. The introduction of Methodism into America, and the commencement of the western emigration, were two contemporary facts. The details to which we have just given attention readily make it apparent how well the Methodist Church was from its origin suited to meet the spiritual wants of the emigrants; it alone was so organized as to be able to follow step by step this movable population, and to carry the Gospel even to the most distant cabin. It alone could be present whenever a grave was opened, or the infant was found in its cradle, or in a single soul there moved an inspiration toward heaven and a desire for prayer. Thus one might well call it the *Church of the West.* The other sects have moved toward the Mississippi as fast as any numbers of their adherents formed part of the emigration thither; but Methodism alone exercised a weighty influence upon the mixed crowd, and to it the mass of the Western population owes its instruction and its belief.

In making mention of the institutions, it would be unjust to forget the men. The first Methodist preachers showed that zeal, that ardor, that power with men which seem the property of all founders of sects, and which are the fruits of disinterestedness and conviction. Asbury, Lee, and M'Kendree, by their truly evangelical labors, by their perseverance under every obstacle, by their poverty and sufferings, might well have appeared to their contemporaries as the worthy successors of the apostles. It were, indeed, impossible to carry self-denial to a greater extent, or to be more completely devoted to the good of others. Francis Asbury, the real founder of American Methodism, was born at Handsworth, near Birmingham, August 20, 1745. Of a disposition naturally serious, so far that he was called from his childhood by his companions *the Curate*, he was converted to Methodism at the age of thirteen, and at sixteen was already an exhorter. At twenty-two he became a traveling preacher; and four years later Wesley, who had a high opinion of him, sent him to America. He was never again to see his native land, although he had left at home an aged mother, for whose wants he continued to provide. The other preachers limited themselves to preaching in the cities of the sea-coast; but Asbury undertook to spread the Gospel tidings into the distant interior, and his success far surpassed his expectations. Therefore would he not leave America, not even in the height of the War of Independence; and when he found his life menaced by the republican authorities he took refuge with one of the converts, where he remained until he could again begin his mission. He presided over the conference at Baltimore, where the institutions of the new Church were formed, and he was commissioned to supervise as bishop the practical working of the organization. He was a man full of dignity, though of affectionate disposition, a strict observer of discipline, and to

all he presented an example of zeal, activity, and toil. Despite the failing of his strength and impaired health, he would devolve upon none other the discharge of any of his duties, and died at the age of seventy-one, in the midst of his episcopal labors, March 31, 1816. He had preached fifty-five years, and had spent forty-five years in America. During these forty-five years he presided at 224 conferences, had preached 16,425 sermons, without reckoning minor addresses, and had traveled in his circuits 90,000 leagues. The journal, in which with short notes he has recorded the employment of his time, presents him to us, now in New England and then among the swamps of Virginia; here on the sea-coast and there in the valley of the Mississippi; traversing afoot, or often on a miserable horse, incredible distances, sleeping on the ground, and suffering by turns hunger, thirst, and sickness. More than once, fearing an attack from the Indians, he stood sentinel all night over his companions who were exhausted by the way. He had to cross the largest rivers on horseback, and content himself in the midst of the woods with the provisions contained in his sack and with wild fruit. It often happened to him to find no lodging-place, and sometimes the proprietor of a cabin set the dogs upon him as he was seen approaching. No obstacle, however, stayed the devoted traveler, sustained as he was by an indefatigable zeal and by the increasing success of his efforts. Much later, referring to a journey made with M'Kendree, he writes: "My strength had yielded to fatigue. We were traveling now in a miserable carriage which had cost us thirty dollars, the expense being shared between us: the purchase had taken all our fortune. What bishops we are! but we bear the Gospel, and we live in a grand era! Each one of our conferences at the West, South, and in Virginia will have this year a thousand souls truly converted to God. Is not that a compensation for a poorly-filled purse? Are we not well paid for our hunger and fatigue? Yea, doubtless, and glory be to God!" The preaching of Asbury had borne fruit, but his words borrowed from his character the chief part of their power. He indulged little in imagination; with an organizing and practical genius, and such sagacity and penetration that he seemed veritably to read the hearts of men, he had the gift of government.

all he presented an example of zeal, activity, and toil. Despite the failing of his strength and impaired health, he would devolve upon none other the discharge of any of his duties, and died at the age of seventy-one, in the midst of his episcopal labors, March 31, 1816. He had preached fifty-five years, and had spent forty-five years in America. During these forty-five years he presided at 224 conferences, had preached 16,425 sermons, without reckoning minor addresses, and had traveled in his circuits 90,000 leagues. The journal, in which with short notes he has recorded the employment of his time, presents him to us, now in New England and then among the swamps of Virginia; here on the sea-coast and there in the valley of the Mississippi; traversing afoot, or often on a miserable horse, incredible distances, sleeping on the ground, and suffering by turns hunger, thirst, and sickness. More than once, fearing an attack from the Indians, he stood sentinel all night over his companions who were exhausted by the way. He had to cross the largest rivers on horseback, and content himself in the midst of the woods with the provisions contained in his sack and with wild fruit. It often happened to him to find no lodging-place, and sometimes the proprietor of a cabin set the dogs upon him as he was seen approaching. No obstacle, however, stayed the devoted traveler, sustained as he was by an indefatigable zeal and by the increasing success of his efforts. Much later, referring to a journey made with M'Kendree, he writes: "My strength had yielded to fatigues. We were traveling now in a miserable carriage which had cost us thirty dollars, the expense being shared between us: the purchase had taken all our fortune. What bishops we are! but we hear the Gospel, and we live in a grand era! Each one of our conferences at the West, South, and in Virginia will have this year a thousand souls truly converted to God. Is not that a compensation for a poorly-filled purse? Are we not well paid for our hunger and fatigue? Yes, doubtless, and glory be to God!" The preaching of Asbury had borne fruit, but his words borrowed from his character the chief part of their power. He indulged little in imagination; with an organizing and practical genius, and such sagacity and penetration that he seemed veritably to read the hearts of men, he had the gift of government.

To M'Kendree eloquence was natural. A native of Virginia, he bore arms in the War of Independence, and raised himself to the grade of adjutant. It was after the conclusion of peace that he felt himself called to preach, and then he abandoned all for the ministry. He directed his efforts to the most distant regions of the West, and soon acquired a great ascendency over the population. His commanding stature, pleasing address, fine figure, musical voice, and the natural eloquence of his look and gesture, all contributed to the effect of his words upon a rude and unthinking people. Crowds followed him, and he was always pleased to find himself in the midst of a multitude. It was he who originated* the *camp-meetings*, which have constituted one of the most peculiar features of Western life, and about which, with equal reason, both good and bad may be said. M'Kendree called together in the midst of the forest the people of a whole county, for without a building of suitable magnitude consecrated to worship there was no way of gathering a large assembly but in the open air. They came from a circumference of twenty leagues, afoot, on horseback, and in wagons: each brought provisions for the journey and a tarry of two days. A large platform was built on which the preacher stood. A trembling seized M'Kendree when he beheld the silent mass around him; he seemed to be without self-control, his tongue hesitated, his words were not at command; then, suddenly, as if touched with a divine fire, he would recover himself, would burst forth in magnificent eloquence, while his voice filled the immense forest, and the sinners whom his words had stricken, as with a thunderbolt, came casting themselves at his feet and crying for mercy. Such occasions of open-air preaching throughout the West were the signals for those great religious movements which periodically appear in the United States, and spread their contagious influence eastwardly from the Mississippi Valley to the Atlantic States. The honor of originating these movements belongs to Methodism and to M'Kendree. The latter had already been twelve years addressing the western population, when Asbury, in 1800, formed the Mississippi Valley into a district, and gave it into his charge. The district comprised

---

* M'Kendree did not originate the camp-meetings. They originated among the Presbyterians, and were adopted by the Methodists.—Tr.

the limits of the present States of Ohio, Kentucky, and Texas, a part of Virginia and of Illinois, embracing in all a territory of 1,500 square miles. M'Kendree had to traverse the whole district four times a year quite alone, and under the peculiar difficulties above described. After eight years M'Kendree was associated with Asbury in the episcopate by the suffrage of the General Conference, and he discharged these functions twenty-seven years; but the later years of his life were passed in great suffering, as a consequence of the infirmities induced by his long wanderings and privations.

It is unnecessary to pass in review all the celebrities of the rising Methodism: let us observe only that the Western people preserve ever a pious remembrance of the devoted evangelists who summoned them to a Christian life. Not all, it must be confessed, were men so wise and remarkable as Asbury and M'Kendree; many are to be esteemed rather for their virtues and their zeal than for their knowledge or talents. Methodism had not then time or the means for bringing out an educated ministry; it could only use the elements at its command. The spirit of propagandism made of each convert another evangelist; the belief that God speaks alike to all hearts, and that all may at any moment receive an inspiration from heaven, rendered acceptable the services of whoever felt himself called to preach. It could, moreover, be expected only of men born in the West, and familiar with its hardships, to confront the fatigues and privations of so laborious a ministry. Some of those preachers were, indeed, half savages, quite lost when they found themselves in the presence of civilization. Here is an example; the scene is laid in the house of the Governor of Ohio:

> It was the custom in those days to eat awhile before the tea and coffee were dished out. Said Sister Tiffin to Brother Axley, "Will you have a cup of tea or coffee?" He asked her if she had any milk. She answered, "Yes." "Well, sister," said he, "give me some milk, for they have nearly scalded my stomach with tea and coffee, and I don't like it." I really thought the Governor would burst out into loud laughter, but he suppressed it; and I thought I must leave the table to laugh; but, casting my eye again at Sister Tiffin, she frowned, and shook her head at me, which helped me very much.
>
> When we went up to bed, said I, "Brother Axley, you surely are the most uncultivated creature I ever saw. Will you never learn any manners?"

the limits of the present States of Ohio, Kentucky, and Tenne a part of Virginia and of Illinois, embracing in all a territory of 1,500 square miles. M'Kendree had to traverse the whole district four times a year quite alone, and under the peculiar difficulties above described. After eight years M'Kendree was associated with Asbury in the episcopate by the suffrage of the General Conference, and he discharged these functions twenty-seven years; but the later years of his life were passed in great suffering, as a consequence of the infirmities induced by his long wanderings and privations.

It is unnecessary to pass in review all the celebrities of the rising Methodism: let us observe only that the Western people preserve ever a pious remembrance of the devoted evangelists who summoned them to a Christian life. Not all, it must be confessed, were men so wise and remarkable as Asbury and M'Kendree; many are to be esteemed rather for their virtues and their zeal than for their knowledge or talents. Methodism had not then time or the means for bringing out an educated ministry; it could only use the elements at its command. The spirit of propagandism made of each convert another evangelist; the belief that God speaks alike to all hearts, and that all may at any moment receive an inspiration from heaven, rendered acceptable the services of whoever felt himself called to preach. It could, moreover, be expected only of men born in the West, and familiar with its hardships, to confront the fatigues and privations of so laborious a ministry. Some of these preachers were, indeed, half savages, quite lost when they found themselves in the presence of civilization. Here is an example; the scene is laid in the house of the Governor of Ohio:

> It was the custom in those days to eat awhile before the tea and coffee were dished out. Said Sister Tiffin to Brother Axley, "Will you have a cup of tea or coffee?" He asked her if she had any milk. She answered, "Yes." "Well, sister," said he, "give me some milk, for they have nearly scalded my stomach with tea and coffee, and I don't like it." I really thought the Governor would burst out into loud laughter, but he suppressed it, and I thought I must leave the table to laugh; but, casting my eyes again at Sister Tiffin, she frowned, and shook her head at me, which helped me very much.
>
> When we went up to bed, said I, "Brother Axley, you surely are the most uncultivated creature I ever saw. Will you never learn any manners?"

Said he, "What have I done?"

"Done!" said I; "you gnawed the meat off your chicken, holding it in your fingers; then whistled up the dog, and threw your bone down on the carpet; and more than this, you talked right at the Governor's table, and in presence of Sister Tiffin, about scalding your stomach with tea and coffee." He burst into tears, and said, "Why did you not tell me better? I didn't know any better."

Next morning, when we awoke, he looked up and saw the plastering of the room all round. "Well," said he, "when I go home I will tell my people that I slept in the Governor's house, and it was a stone house too, and plastered at that."

Having been raised almost in a cane-brake, and never been accustomed to see any thing but log-cabins, it was a great thing for him to behold a good house and sleep in a plastered room. But I tell you, my readers, he was a great and good minister of Jesus Christ. He often said, a preacher that was good and true had a trinity of devils to fight, namely, superfluous dress, whisky, and slavery; and he seldom ever preached but he shared it to all three of these evils like a man of God.

Preachers like Axley furnished good occasion for ridicule to the *Yankees;* that is, the emigrants from New England, a people of glib tongues, eager for controversy, and who brought to the West all the refined heresies which were provoked by Puritanism and every sort of philosophy. It was no small matter for a poor backwoods preacher, furnished only with his Bible, to hold up against all these sharp wits ready with their sophistries. Thus one of the preachers confessed that the conflict with Unitarianism, Universalism, and all the *isms* of the East, had been the best school for him, and had contributed more than aught else to his readiness in argument. If the educated emigrants affected a certain disdain for the Methodist preachers, it was not so with the mass, who beheld with great favor these rude and vigorous men showing traits and leading a life similar to that of their own. Did they not endure privations and discomfort? Were they not compelled to sleep on the ground, to be satisfied with a morsel of bread, or sometimes to dispense with even this? Did not the preachers wear, like themselves, coarse stuff woven in the cottage? and was not the hand of charity often called upon to repair or replace these garments, torn by the roadside thorns? When the emigrant in his poor cabin saw emerging from the forest, seated on his emaciated horse, a man of sun-burnt hue, who bore the marks

of fatigue, his garments, perhaps, still dripping with the water of the river he had just crossed, and when he found that the man, after having asked to sleep beneath his roof and to offer prayer with him, then spoke to him in the simple and expressive language of the people, with its familiar images and natural persuasiveness, his heart readily opened to the stranger and to his words. The well-endowed minister who, in the neighboring town, gave out every Sabbath to his congregation a formal sermon, might indeed be a great scholar; but the preacher in home-spun clothes, who often had not a dollar in his pocket, but who knew well enough how to find the way to human hearts, that was, indeed, the man of God.

So it was, that when, at the end of half a century, the settled Churches of the Atlantic States began to pay some attention to the spiritual wants of the West, and sought now some recruits upon the banks of the Mississippi, their efforts were but moderately appreciated by the people. These regarded themselves as insulted when they were addressed as being less truly Christians or less intelligent than the *Yankees*. Read this lively satire upon the Eastern preachers:

> About this time there were a great many young missionaries sent out to this country to civilize and Christianize the poor heathen of the West. They would come with a tolerable education, and a smattering knowledge of the old Calvinistic system of theology. They were generally tolerably well furnished with old manuscript sermons, that had been preached, or written, perhaps a hundred years before. Some of these sermons they had memorized, but in general they read them to the people. This way of reading sermons was out of fashion altogether in this Western world, and of course they produced no good effect among the people. The great mass of our Western people wanted a preacher that could mount a stump, a block, or old log, or stand in the bed of a wagon and, without note or manuscript, quote, expound, and apply the word of God to the hearts and consciences of the people. The result of the efforts of these Eastern missionaries was not very flattering; and although the Methodist preachers were in reality the pioneer heralds of the cross throughout the entire West, and although they had raised up numerous societies and Churches every five miles, and notwithstanding we had hundreds of traveling and local preachers accredited and useful ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, yet these newly-fledged missionaries would write back to the old States hardly any thing else but wailings and lamentations over the moral wastes and destitute condition of the West

of fatigue, his garments, perhaps, still dripping with the water of the river he had just crossed, and when he found that the man, after having asked to sleep beneath his roof and to offer prayer with him, then spoke to him in the simple and expressive language of the people, with its familiar images and natural persuasiveness, his heart readily opened to the stranger and to his words. The well-endowed minister who, in the neighboring town, gave out every Sabbath to his congregation a formal sermon, might indeed be a great scholar; but the preacher in home-spun clothes, who often had not a dollar in his pocket, but who knew well enough how to find the way to human hearts, that was, indeed, the man of God.

So it was, that when, at the end of half a century, the settled Churches of the Atlantic States began to pay some attention to the spiritual wants of the West, and sought now some recruits upon the banks of the Mississippi, their efforts were but moderately appreciated by the people. These regarded themselves as insulted when they were addressed as being less truly Christians or less intelligent than the *Yankees*. Read this lively satire upon the Eastern preachers:

> About this time there were a great many young missionaries sent out to this country to civilize and Christianize the poor heathen of the West. They would come with a tolerable education, and a smattering knowledge of the old Calvinistic system of theology. They were generally tolerably well furnished with old manuscript sermons, that had been preached, or written, perhaps a hundred years before. Some of these sermons they had memorized, but in general they read them to the people. This way of reading sermons was out of fashion altogether in this Western world, and of course they produced no good effect among the people. The great mass of our Western people wanted a preacher that could mount a stump, a block, or old log, or stand in the bed of a wagon and, without note or manuscript, quote, expound, and apply the word of God to the hearts and consciences of the people. The result of the efforts of these Eastern missionaries was not very flattering; and although the Methodist preachers were in reality the pioneer heralds of the cross throughout the entire West, and although they had raised up numerous societies and Churches every few miles, and notwithstanding we had hundreds of traveling and local preachers accredited and useful ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, yet these newly-fledged missionaries would write back to the old States hardly any thing else but wailings and lamentations over the moral wastes and destitute condition of the West

These letters would be read in their large congregations, stating that they had traveled hundreds of miles and found no evangelical minister, and the poor perishing people were in a fair way to be lost for the want of the bread of life; and the ignorant or uninformed thousands that heard these letters read would melt into tears, and their sympathies be greatly moved when they considered our lost and heathenish state, and would liberally contribute their money to send us more missionaries, or to support those that were already here. Thus some of these missionaries, after occupying our pulpits and preaching in large and respectable Methodist congregations, would write back and give those doleful tidings. Presently their letters would be printed, and come back among us as published facts in some of their periodicals.

Now, what confidence could the people have in such missionaries, who would state things as facts that had not even the semblance of truth in them? Thus I have known many of them destroy their own usefulness, and cut off all access to the people; and, indeed, they have destroyed all confidence in them as ministers of truth and righteousness, and caused the way of truth to be evil spoken of. On a certain occasion, when these reports came back known to contain false statements, the citizens of Quincy called a meeting, mostly out of the Church, and after discussing the subject pledged themselves to give me a thousand dollars per annum, and bear all my traveling expenses, if I would go as a missionary to the New England States and enlighten them on this and other subjects of which they considered them profoundly ignorant. But, owing to circumstances beyond my control, I was obliged to decline the acceptance of their generous offer.

If it had been consistently in my power, how gladly and willingly would I have undertaken this labor of love, and gloried in enlightening them down East, that they might keep their home-manufactured clergy at home, or give them some honorable employment better suited to their genius than that of reading old musty and worm-eaten volumes! If this matter is rightly looked into it will astonish every well-informed man to see the self-importance and self-complacence of these little home-manufactured fellows. If they would tarry at Jericho till their beards were grown out, it certainly would be more creditable to themselves and to all others concerned, and especially to the cause of God.

The model of a Western preacher is the very man whose words I have just quoted, namely, Peter Cartwright, or, as he is called throughout the Mississippi Valley, *Uncle* Cartwright. From his memoirs I have already borrowed more than one extract.*

* The citations from Cartwright's Autobiography in these pages are taken directly from the original.

ARTICLE IV.—SIN.

THE most appalling fact of this universe is sin. So far as this race is concerned, it is the most universal and momentous, the most stubborn and overwhelming. It is that round which ceaselessly circles thought, action, character, destiny. It haunts us like our shadow, mocks us in our pleasures, sits with us when we sit at meat, enters into our most secret thoughts. It is present with us even when we would do good, stirring within us a fearful looking-for of fiery indignation and judgment. It reaches every thing: our joys, our treasures, our fondest ambitions—alas! "the trail of the serpent is over them all."

It seems to the writer that one of our chiefest needs at present is a profounder doctrine, a more radical and heart-searching teaching concerning this matter of sin. We are drifting away from the old landmarks. Conviction is dying out. Conscience, so to speak, is becoming atrophied. A subtle rationalism is imperceptibly pervading the community, foiling the arrows of truth, and rendering much of the preaching of none effect.

WHAT IS SIN?—It is no mere infirmity, or misfortune, or physical distemper. Social science can never medicine to cure. Were it a mere weakness, and, as such, amenable to treatment at the hands of the humane, conscience would its never bear witness against it. There is a radical distinction between mere physical frailty, or a mere physical misdemeanor, and a moral one. The former ends with ourself: the latter stands related to a higher tribunal. Concerning the former, Conscience utters no voice. Concerning the latter, whatever the extenuating circumstances, she thunders of a broken law and an offended God. The offender, whatever the pretext under which the act was performed, is convicted, not of any mere indiscretion, or of an imprudence, but of *sin*—of positive guilt—of downright turpitude. The materialism, therefore, that can see in "sin" only one of the "ills that flesh is heir to;" the rationalism that fain would see in it a negative good, an evil in appearance only,

but really and in itself the necessary means to a good end, and, therefore, a good, do violence to the universal and unequivocal testimony of conscience.

1. The first distinctive feature of sin is, it is an offense against God. The only way to determine the essential character of sin is to discuss it as a fact of individual experience—to inquire what is known concerning it within the sphere of every man's consciousness. And the testimony of the conscience of the race, as such, is to the effect that sin consists in an offense against, or a want of conformity to, the known will of God. "Whosoever committeth sin," says the Apostle John, "transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." What law? Any mere arbitrary law, a simple rule of action prescribing the appropriate means for the attainment of a given end? No. It is a law revealing and affirming itself in our consciousness, and carrying with it the seal of divine authority; a law asserting itself as an ultimate and unconditional law of rectitude, and hence, in itself, essentially and absolutely good; a law inseparable from our very idea or conception of God as the supreme good, prescribing for all rational beings, not immediately rules of outward conduct, but ends—rather, the rightful and ultimate ends at which they are to aim. To transgress the requirements of this law, revealed, as we have seen, and more or less clearly according to the heed we give to it, in our consciences, and taking cognizance, as it were, and determining the character of our purposes and the ends we propose to ourselves, or to aim at ends opposed to those which this law proposes as absolutely good—*this is sin;* that evil and bitter thing which the soul recognizes in the oppressive sense of guilt and remorse.

2. Because thus an offense against, and in the sight of, an infinitely pure and holy God, sin, in the next place, as a fact of experience interpreted in the light of our own consciences, and independent of speculative theories, appears to be truly and unconditionally evil. That is to say, it is evil in itself, is inherently evil, and only evil, no conceivable circumstances or relations being able to convert it into any thing else. It is on this account that, whatever its accompaniments or consequences, unlike mere physical evil, or that evil whose character depends wholly on outward relations, moral evil is ever the

occasion of self-reproach and remorse, simply as evil. The severest and most painful evils of an outward and physical nature may be the means and necessary condition of our highest good, and as such we may rejoice in and thank God for them. But who would ever think, nay, dare to thank God that he had been guilty of sin? Your sinful intentions, you say, have been overruled, and made instrumental for the accomplishment of desirable ends. What of that? Do your intentions, as moral acts, therefore appear any the less evil? or does this pretext in the least diminish your sense of guilt and of the inherent evil of sin? Whether well-grounded or otherwise, can the belief or the assumption just referred to in the least alleviate the sentence of condemnation which conscience passes upon the commission of sin? Ah! the one fatal condition in all such cases is, we ourselves know what our acts are, as opposed to our sense of duty, and contrary to that holy law revealed in the conscience of every man; and on this account it is that those acts become unqualifiedly and malignantly evil, and we ourselves ill-deserving transgressors of the law of God, and exposed to the righteous judgment, not only of our own consciences, but of Him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.

3. Another essential, characteristic element of sin is, the purpose of the agent. Considered apart from the purpose of the agent, the motive or design of an intelligent, responsible being, acts have no moral, but only an outward and physical, character. They cannot be said properly to be either right or wrong. Thus, the killing of a man becomes murder only upon the imputation of a malice prepense. And our Saviour, meantime, goes so far as to affirm, that if we but cherish the malicious purpose, and lack only the outward occasion or opportunity to carry it into effect, we are already, in the sight of conscience and of God, guilty of murder. Except, then, as contemplated in a living union with our own moral being, and grounded in our own purposes and inward principles as good or evil, we have no concern with any act in regard to a supposed moral character. Indeed, unless we can impute it wholly to our own causative agency, and recognize it as truly and properly our own, how can we hold ourselves responsible for, or condemn ourselves for, the commission of any given

evil act? A sense of guilt and of condemnation necessarily implies, in regard to our conduct, that we condemn what was truly our act and performed under the condition of a responsibility for the deed. It is utterly incompatible with any proper sense of guilt to refer our conduct to whatever cause we may conceive, out of ourselves, as efficiently producing it. "I ordained their freedom," says man's Maker in the "Paradise Lost," "they themselves ordained their fall." When conscience speaks at all, it tells us not only that we have transgressed the law of righteousness, but that we ought not to have done so, might not have done so, and hence are personally and wholly accountable for the evil. If it were possible wholly to divest ourselves of the sense of responsibility for our evil purposes and deeds by any speculative notions which we may form in respect to the nature of our moral agency, such an effect must necessarily be produced by every system which refers our moral principles and acts to the agency of any cause or motive out of ourselves. Divesting us of our free agency, in the eminent sense of that term, according to which our moral purposes and acts have their true and proper origin in our own being, such system's, of course, divest us at the same time of all real accountability, and make the sense of guilt contradictory and delusive. Sin, in that case, instead of a positive evil originating in ourselves and opposed to God, ceases at once, and of necessity, to be the evil thing which, in the simplicity of our conscientious convictions, we had taken it to be, and becomes simply an outward and incidental affection, or, at best, only a means to an end. Only, then, by the assumption of an absolutely free and responsible will can the true character of sin be interpreted and understood.

Finally, our sense of sin—of that inward moral evil for which we find ourselves responsible—is not limited to our immediate and distinctly conscious purposes, but extends to the secret and, it may be, unconscious principle from which they spring. We talk a great deal about motives. No matter what the outward motive or occasion, it is always by virtue of the moral state of the heart that these external considerations have the power to become motives, prompting the thief to his midnight plunder, or the murderer to the assassination of his victim. But, says one, I had supposed that, whatever the

inward drift of character, we were responsible only for our immediate and conscious purposes; or, if you please, for such tendencies, impulses, intentions springing from that inward principle as we voluntarily approved or adopted, or consciously refused to resist. Be not deceived. However we may imagine ourselves irresponsible, or infer from a course of reasoning, however plausible or well intended, that our minds are swayed and our purposes controlled, either by the force of motives acting from without as a necessary cause, or by an inward and almost, if not quite, unconscious drift of being, a fully-awakened conscience will promptly break through all these sophistries, sweep away all these hollow devices and refuges of lies, and tell the deluded soul, in terms which it cannot gainsay, that it is out of his own evil heart that has originated and come forth this guilty purpose and this wicked act. The votary of a lawless ambition is responsible not merely for the particular acts which he purposes and commits, but for the ambition, the wrong principle itself. But he may be insensible of it. No matter; it is his business to be sensible of it. Whatever principle of action manifests itself within us as directing and controlling our purposes, if in opposition to that law which prescribes the ultimate and absolute end at which we ought to aim, we instinctively, on perceiving, recognize it as wrong, and impute the same to ourselves as sin; nor do we feel our responsibility or guilt the less when we find such wrong principles so deeply seated that, though they have acquired entire control over us, our minds, in consequence, have become quite blinded to all right views of truth and duty. Look at that man of business, with his whole mind occupied and all his thoughts absorbed in the accumulation of wealth. His ordinary consciousness extends only to the immediate purposes and occupations of the day. Of the deeper principle characterizing these, working in him and shaping all his ends, he is, perhaps, for the time wholly unconscious. Shall we say that, therefore, this man is excusable for his blindness and insensibility? Can his unconsciousness of that worldly, selfish principle that thus, by its pervading, controlling influence, distinctly marks the whole character of that man, be plead in extenuation of his guilt? Would it not be a more natural thing to say, that man ought not to be thus inward drift of character, we were responsible only for our immediate and conscious purposes; or, if you please, for such tendencies, impulses, intentions springing from that inward principle as we voluntarily approved or adopted, or consciously refused to resist. Be not deceived. However we may imagine ourselves irresponsible, or infer from a course of reasoning, however plausible or well intended, that our minds are swayed and our purposes controlled, either by the force of motives acting from without as a necessary cause, or by an inward and almost, if not quite, unconscious drift of being, a fully-awakened conscience will promptly break through all these sophistries, sweep away all these hollow devices and refuges of lies, and tell the deluded soul, in terms which it cannot gainsay, that it is out of his own evil heart that has originated and come forth this guilty purpose and this wicked act. The votary of a lawless ambition is responsible not merely for the particular acts which he purposes and commits, but for the ambition, the wrong principle itself. But he may be insensible of it. No matter; it is his business to be sensible of it. Whatever principle of action manifests itself within us as directing and controlling our purposes, if in opposition to that law which prescribes the ultimate and absolute end at which we ought to aim, we instinctively, on perceiving, recognize it as wrong, and impute the same to ourselves as sin; nor do we feel our responsibility or guilt the less when we find such wrong principles so deeply seated that, though they have acquired entire control over us, our minds, in consequence, have become quite blinded to all right views of truth and duty. Look at that man of business, with his whole mind occupied and all his thoughts absorbed in the accumulation of wealth. His ordinary consciousness extends only to the immediate purposes and occupations of the day. Of the deeper principle characterizing these, working in him and shaping all his ends, he is, perhaps, for the time wholly unconscious. Shall we say that, therefore, this man is excusable for his blindness and insensibility? Can his unconsciousness of that worldly, selfish principle that thus, by its pervading, controlling influence, distinctly marks the whole character of that man, be plead in extenuation of his guilt? Would it not be a more natural thing to say, that man ought not to be thus unconscious of the deeper and dominant impulses of his being, of the law and obligations of duty, of his higher destiny as a rational and moral being? and will not his own conscience, whenever he is awakened to a sense of its admonitions, reproach him for the neglect of other, and higher, and more momentous duties? Experience, I am sure, warrants the assertion, that whenever awakened to a deeper knowledge of ourselves, and made conscious of the presence of these wrong principles of action, we are constrained to feel, not only that we are responsible for their character, but are justly chargeable with it as an evil, in the view of conscience and of God—as a deep and radical evil, affecting our essential characters as accountable beings, and constituting us sinners in the sight of God.

First. In the light of the foregoing teaching, we can understand how it is, that in proportion as we have a practical knowledge of our own hearts, as manifested in the light of truth, we shall be constrained to humble ourselves. Before human tribunals, and having reference only to the conventional rights and duties of civil society, we may stand upon our integrity, and lay claim, perhaps, to virtuous and upright intentions. We may discourse, too, of the exalted rank and dignity allotted us among the creatures of this lower world, and with good reason render thanks to God for the high destiny to which we were formed in the divine purpose. But when we look into ourselves and ask what have been our purposes, consider what is demanded by a law which is holy and spiritual, place ourselves before Him who searcheth the heart, we can only say, God be merciful to us, sinners! In proportion to the increasing brightness of that divine light which shines within us, dissipating all self-flattering delusions by exposing in their true character the motives and principles that govern us, we shall become self-abased. Such has been the experience of the most eminently godlike and holy men in every age. "I have heard of thee," says the ancient patriarch, "by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee: wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."

Second. We cannot shun responsibility by abiding in darkness. We cannot escape the consequences of evil principles lurking within us by remaining in ignorance of what they are.

It is enough for us that we ought not to be ignorant of ourselves, but to walk in the clear light of divine truth, and to keep consciences void of offense. "It is," says another, "the express purpose and effect of divine truth, and of the holy law of God, to make known to us our true character, and to bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and to make manifest the counsels of the heart." "But," says one, "if a person only be sincere, must he not be esteemed guiltless whatever the nature or tendency of the maxims practiced?" We may well inquire, What is to be understood by "sincerity" here? Is it that easy-going, slipshod thing usually had in mind when this quite popular, but very specious, plea is made? There is a vast deal of juggling with this word "sincerity." It is made to cover and disguise an amazing amount of sophistry. Be not deceived. No sincerity consisting in a mere meaning to do, a mere seeming to be right, can ever save one. "There is a way that seemeth to be right, but the end thereof is death." The only "sincerity" that can ever be successfully plead in extenuation of one's ignorance or insensibility is that which has taken the form of earnest conviction—conclusions wrought out through agonizing struggles and fierce conflicts.

Thirdly. Nothing, as a principle of action, but righteousness can save character. What is your highest motive? Is it the desire of happiness, or to go to heaven? That will never do. Is there not reason to fear that the character and purpose of the Gospel are exposed to grievous misapprehension from a too exclusive reference to the natural desire for happiness, too exclusive appeals to motives of self-interest, in the exhortations and instructions from the pulpit, over that simple exhibition of divine truth calculated to awaken a consciousness of sin and of the obligation to be holy? True, our Saviour and his apostles sometimes, nay, often, address themselves to the interests, the hopes, and the fears of men; nor can any one doubt that, to arouse men from the lethargy and false security of sin, this is necessary and proper. But as the highest motive by which the good man should be governed, and as a principle of action on which the awakened sinner can safely rest, it is authorized neither by conscience nor the word of God. Many have been the slurs flung at Christianity by those who have represented it as appealing only to motives of self-interest; and many men

it is quite possible, of strong minds, and not wholly regardless of truth and duty, perceiving but too readily that these are not the highest grounds of moral action, have been alienated from the doctrines and duties of Christianity by being led to misconceive it as a system which appealed only to mercenary motives, to the fears of punishment and hopes of reward in a future life. An old writer has said that "so much occasion is sometimes given for men to fall into this fatal error, that one might almost be tempted to wish, according to a fable of one of the Christian fathers, for the annihilation of both heaven and hell, in order that men might serve God from pure love, or from naked principle, without fear of punishment or hope of reward."

The most ardent religious devotee, therefore, if his highest motive be only to serve a human ecclesiasticism or to get to heaven; if his conscience, at best, be only an ecclesiastical conscience, and his highest aim to accommodate himself to, or to heed the behests of, certain ecclesiastical superiors, is, as yet, not only in bondage, but in sin. Was not just this Paul's condition previous to his conversion? His "good conscience" was only an ecclesiastical conscience, one cultivated and kept simply by the faithful observance of all the ordinances and requirements of his Church. If, while yet "breathing out threatening and slaughter" against the infant Christian Church, he "verily thought he was doing God's service"—was in the path of duty—it could only have been in this low ecclesiastical sense. There can be no doubt but that, in his secret soul, Paul had his misgivings as to the strict righteousness of that persecuting business; misgivings that finally culminated so gloriously on his way to Damascus, bursting, at the first prick of the accuser's voice, into, "What, Lord, wilt thou have me to do?" Nay, we are not surprised that when Paul came thus to have his mind fully opened to the light of divine truth, and thereby to become deeply conscious of the inward sources in which his former purposes had had their origin, his conscience unqualifiedly condemned them as evil—bore witness that, though hitherto he had been but dimly, doubtfully conscious of them, those principles of action yet ought not to have been.

Righteousness, we repeat, is the only principle that will hold

as a safe and saving groundwork of character, both as an immediate rule of outward conduct and as the rightful and ultimate end at which we are to aim. Does the skeptic, failing to apprehend many of the spiritual doctrines of the Gospel, yet adopt as his supreme motive the desire, the purpose, to be and to do right in the sight of God? Then must he be saved, though as by fire. Is the religious devotee actually actuated by this same highest of motives? Then, even though a persecuting fanatic, (albeit it is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of such a case,) he must be accounted not only guiltless, but holy.

The doctrine said to have been recently enunciated by Dr. Goss, Roman Catholic Bishop of Liverpool, indicating a marvelous stretch of Christian liberality and bad "churchmanship" for a Roman prelate, evidently cannot be gainsaid. Speaking of us Protestants, he is reported to have said: "Though they reject the ordinance of the Catholic Church, yet if they are sincere in their belief, and follow the light as far as God has given it to them, I believe that the Almighty will have regard to their sincerity of belief, and that, if they have a real and true sorrow for sin, it will suffice for their salvation."

Lastly. On this ground, and with this view, we can in some measure apprehend that lost condition, the extent and malignity of the evil, the depth and hopelessness of the ruin, from which, in the boundless love of God, his Son came to redeem us. If we are not only poor and miserable in ourselves, but guilty of rebellion against God and of opposition to his holy law; if we are not only cursed and consumed by the physical consequences of transgression, but are under just condemnation of conscience for sin, and are hereby exposed to its righteous and unmeasured penalty, we may apprehend, in some degree, how "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." In a word, if we so feel the evil of sin as a principle affecting our inmost and most essential character, and bringing us into bondage to the law in our members, which is the law of selfishness, as to realize the necessity of some higher principle than belongs to our enslaved natural will to overcome and subdue its malignant power, then shall we be prepared practically to receive

the doctrine that we must be born again, and to hail with joy and thanksgiving the proffered aids of any spiritual power promising to deliver us from this dominion of sin and death and to restore us to spiritual and eternal life. That very power, happily, resides in Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of all grace. Uncounted myriads have testified, and are now testifying, that Jesus Christ has power on earth to forgive sins; that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. The true end and purpose of the Gospel is to eradicate and subdue that self-seeking principle or tendency of the natural will which, as opposed to the law of love or the law of the Spirit, must be accounted essentially evil, and by the power of divine truth, and the aids of that Spirit which always accompanies and abides in the truth, to impart to, or implant within, us a higher and spiritual principle of obedience to the divine law, and thus truly recreate us in righteousness and true holiness, and restore in us forever the ruins of the fall.

ART. V.—THE CHRISTIAN PASTORATE.

The Christian Pastorate: Its Character, Responsibilities, and Duties. By DANIEL P. KIDDER, D.D., Author of "A Treatise on Homiletics," "Sketches of Residence and Travels in Brazil," etc. Pp. 569. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

WHEN Christ "ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men;" and among these divine gifts for the completion of all things we find that of Pastors and Teachers, the two offices frequently in one person. When a man is divinely appointed to any given work, he may expect that work to afford him enough of labor and enough of reward; and the Christian minister finds that his office is no sinecure, his labor no insignificant thing, and his reward in proportion to his faithfulness and efficiency in his calling. While God calls men to the work of the ministry, and grants them abundant evidence of that call, he does not furnish them with the qualifications they can themselves obtain. While the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway," is freely given, yet the man of God is not perfect, nor thoroughly furnished unto all good works by that single promise. There is a preparation

necessary, and there are many things to be learned, and some things to be suffered, before the Lord's anointed can show himself to be a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. Many ministers can be found to-day who have been divinely called, but who have not honestly obeyed that call by proper education and preparation. If Jesus needed the discipline of the wilderness and the purification of suffering, how much more do we need all preparation that can aid us in battling against the fearful numbers and deadly hatred of our vigilant foes. If, then, something besides the divine afflatus is needed, something more human, it is well that some competent man should give to the Church such directions and assistance as may be needed for the successful accomplishment of the great work of saving men from their sins. We know of no man more fully qualified for aiding and instructing young ministers in their grand vocation than Dr. Kidder, whose recent work is now under review. Few boys become successful teachers of a district school before they are fourteen years of age; and comparatively few men are found who are at once good preachers, successful teachers, and excellent pastors. Dr. Kidder is one of those few, and from his fourteenth year he has been unconsciously preparing himself for the making of just such a book as is now offered to the world. Dr. Kidder's arduous and successful labors as a pastor, missionary, editor of Sunday-school publications, and theological professor, certainly eminently fit him for speaking *ex cathedra* upon nearly all the duties and responsibilities that a Christian minister may meet in a long time of service. As is quite natural, we find in this book the author's own plan of work, such as he carried out as far as possible in his own pastoral life; and while it is in some sense a statement of his own practice, yet it may serve as a guide to those who are, or intend to be, ministers of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It will be observed that the book is not entitled the "*Methodist*," but the "*Christian*" Pastorate, and there was evidently a design in this caption; and the contents of the work show, clearly, that all pastors can find in its pages food for thought and rules for a successful ministerial life. The needs and desires of all people are very similar, and the method used by any successful pastor, in any one denomination, would make him a

success in any other congregation. If a man is a fine speaker, a superior orator, he will be prized for his talent by any community; if he is an excellent expositor, a clear-headed and warm-hearted minister, he will be welcome among any people; and if he is a faithful, tender, efficient pastor, any Church will love him and delight in his ministrations. So that the instructions, advice, and experience given by our author can well be used by ministers of all denominations, and thus the book ceases to be a denominational one, and it rightfully appeals to Christian ministers every-where for circulation and study. It is almost needless to say any thing concerning the style of our author, as his writings are so well known to the readers of the *Quarterly.* This much we will venture to say, that while Dr. Kidder rarely enters the region of real eloquence, he also rarely falls below the standard of correct writing. His style is unusually clear, and generally direct; and he is a master of pure English, although occasionally we find repetitions of thought that mar the purity of the rhetoric, and in a few cases there is an undue mingling of subjects. These imperfections are easily accounted for, when we remember the habits of the teacher, and reflect that the one who teaches successfully must repeat his words and ideas until the scholar grasps and holds the thought presented. Thus, we will find that our author occasionally very naturally bends, if he does not break, some of the rules usually insisted upon by precise writers. Yet there are some passages of real beauty and power, where the didactic style can safely be laid aside, as in pages 38 and 39. One of the chief excellences of this work is the constant reference to Holy Writ, and nearly every debatable question is settled by direct quotation from God's word. In this way we have a perfect mine of wealth, and the positions taken are so fully established by divine authority that but little remains to be questioned or opposed.

The General Introduction, of twenty-eight pages, rapidly but clearly sketches the New Testament ideal of the Christian ministry, and investigates the primeval origin of sacrifices and their design. It also discusses the necessity of faith, the origin, diffusion, and consequences of idolatry, and brings the reader down through the types, shadows, and ceremonies of Jewish priesthood and Mosaic dispensation, until he is found face to face with the

ministerial character of Christ; and then Jesus, as prophet, teacher, priest, and king, is held up to the gaze of the Church and ministry. Rarely does an Introduction cover so much ground and do it so well. In these opening pages we have the key-note to the whole book; and as Christ is the great model, so is he held up faithfully, throughout nearly every page, as the one for whom we are to labor, and by whom we are to have victory in all our conflicts here, and final triumph when done with earth. Our author finds in the Lord Jesus Christ the "sole and authoritative head of his own Church," and in him discerns "the inherent and legal right of prescribing whatever ordinances or offices were necessary to the extension and perpetuation of the Church in the world."—P. 53. The full and exhaustive proofs of this position are carefully drawn from the Scriptures, and every point is completely guarded by appropriate quotations. In the very inception of the apostolic idea of a Christian ministry the need of a Christian pastorate was found. Wherever sheep were to be brought into a fold or fed a pastor was needed, and Christ's instructions to his disciples were exceedingly definite on this point. Such commands as "Feed my sheep," "Feed my lambs," mean nothing less than an intense love of souls, to be manifested by such care and provision for the flock that none shall be lost through the neglect of the overseers. In elaborating this idea of preparing to care for the flock, it is not strange that our author inserts Mosheim's comment on schools of instruction for young ministers, or biblical institutes, as we term them; for the writer has been and is so closely identified with such schools, that, quite naturally, he can indorse nearly every thing looking toward the education of ministerial licentiates. He does not, however, insist with Mosheim that Paul and Timothy had charge of training schools, and that a part of their duties was the preparing of young men for the care and government of the Churches. Perhaps no portion of Dr. Kidder's book is of more interest or importance than that devoted to the discussion of the ministerial call. This he examines through two chapters, and three practical questions are asked and answered: (1) In what manner does God call his ministers? (2) How may an individual certainly know that he is called of God to the ministry?

(3) By what signs may the Church be satisfied of the divine call of a ministerial candidate?—P. 107. Some of us who are pastors know full well how we struggled, in years gone by, with doubts and fears; and we know, too, how often young men have come to us for light, and advice, and instruction on the questions asked above. Eternity alone can reveal the hours of mental anguish, the tears, the groans that have fallen to the lot of some who have become flaming heralds of the cross. In some cases importunate prayer has seemingly availed nothing in the settlement of this question, because, perhaps, God has given us certain tests by which we may determine for ourselves whether we are called of him to the office and work of the ministry or not. These tests are so clearly defined in these two chapters that almost any one with the ordinary illumination of the Holy Spirit can walk in the path of duty, free from harassing doubts and anxious fears.

The presentation of the historical view of the ministerial call very conclusively shows that a divine command to the work of the ministry was recognized in the Old Testament Scriptures, and that spiritual agencies were largely employed in the propagation of religion in the times of the Mosaic and prophetic dispensations. But passing from what we find taught between the time of Adam and Malachi, we are brought at once to the practice of the Apostolic Church. When we consider the call and appointment of Matthias, of the seven deacons, of the elders of the Church, and especially the amazing miracle displayed in the arrest, conversion, and call of him of Tarsus, who can longer question God's direct interference in the appointments of our lives? If so be that the Holy Ghost needs witnesses of a certain type, and peculiarly adapted to a peculiar work, why doubt that a divine call is given to that work? It is really unthinkable that God should need special men for a special work, and yet be either unable or unwilling to notify such men unmistakably of his purposes and plans. He who carefully studies the ecclesiastical history of the last eighteen centuries will see too many traces of the divine management, too many clear evidences of the hand of God in directing the Church and its ministers, to hesitate long about the *theory* of a divine call to the high and holy work of the Christian ministry. But leaving the historical view, we pass at once to the

practical aspect, or the internal call or bias toward the work of preaching the Gospel of the Son of God. Remembering that service at the altar does not constitute a priesthood, and that men are called to that service by the Holy Spirit and also by the Church, we have only to keep in mind the additional fact that God must have divers manners in which to call men into the service at the altar. This fact is admirably discussed by our author, and in this way relief will be brought to many a mind that has been in doubt because no call, like that given to Paul or Wesley, has been heard. As the Spirit deals with each person according to individual capacity or disposition, so will the call to the ministry differ as it comes to men of different minds and under different circumstances. If the Lord calls a man as he called the child Samuel, all that man has to do is to declare his readiness to hear what the Lord has to say, and an equal willingness to do whatever he commands. Usually we find there are three periods in the call to the ministry: (1) That of awakening and inquiry; (2) that of conviction, more or less clear; (3) that of settled purpose and determined action. Probably, in very many cases, the first two stages above mentioned will be practically one, as the conviction very frequently comes with the awakening. But, in many cases, the earnest seeker after God's will can find it by analyzing his mental states, by comparing his convictions with the rule as laid down in Holy Writ and as illuminated by the Spirit of truth. A careful study of this part of our author's proposition and argument will be of incalculable value to all who feel that they are, in the least, called to consider the propriety of entering upon the ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the good results to flow from this clear and forcible presentation of this important subject will not be fully seen until the day that shall declare every man's work, of what sort it is. Not only is the fact proven that God does directly call men into the work of the ministry, but the distinction between the internal and external call is also lucidly set forth. The former is said to be the divine impulse communicated directly by the Spirit, and confirmed by the providence of God. The latter is the voice of the Church.

Whenever a converted man feels that the divine impulse urges him to make the calling of sinners to repentance his particular work, and when the Church adds to that impulse her voice of

approval, then may he at once begin that work, if properly prepared, and look for the promised result, which in all cases is fruit. If God gives to the minister no souls as his hire, and no seals to his ministry, the presumption amounts to a certainty that he has not understood the divine impulse, and that the Church has failed to understand what work the Lord has committed to him. It is well to say here that scores of excellent and able men are excluded from the ministry because of mistaken notions held both by them and by the Church. Some denominations think that if a man is called to preach the Gospel he can preach only as a regularly settled pastor; and thus many, who are as truly called of God as Aaron was, stifle conviction and continue in secular work, and never try to declare publicly the great doctrines of salvation. The Methodist Church is wiser than this; and hence we have a grand army of grand men, called local preachers, who can work at the bench or follow the plow for six days, and on the seventh declare to listening thousands the unsearchable riches of the kingdom of Christ. There are many honest and talented men who think that a call to preach includes a call to travel and to serve as pastor, and, hesitating to enter the traveling connection, they make shipwreck of faith and run the risk of losing their souls. If they were obedient to the heavenly vision, they would soon be found on the highways, alongside of hedges, among the poor and neglected, breaking the bread of life unto famishing hundreds as local preachers. The call to the ministry is one thing, and the call to the pastorate is another. They may often be found together, and also often separately. It is frequently considered to be almost a crime for a successful Methodist minister to locate or to cease traveling; as if a man who declines to take work at the hands of the bishop cannot, under favorable circumstances, do as much preaching and as much good—aside from mere pastoral work—outside of the itinerancy as within it. Only let the various denominations feel that local preachers can become a great power, and there soon will be a change in this particular among our sister Churches. Also let the doubter, afflicted with fear concerning his call, remember that "he that winneth souls is wise," whether he does it on his farm or in a regularly given parish, and he will go at his divinely appointed work with a zeal that

will insure success. There are to-day hundreds of men in our connection who have ceased to travel, yet are doing more for the Church and the Saviour than they could have done in the regular pastorate.

Assuming that a man is aware of the divine call and is obedient thereunto, there arises at once the question concerning his ministerial duties, and our author is so full and so explicit upon this point that but little remains even to be inferred. He assumes, that although the minister's calling involves a vast number and a great variety of duties, yet preaching and the pastoral care generically embrace them all. (*Vide* pp. 132, 133.) While our author is probably about correct in theory, we think, as stated by us previously, that effective work can be done by the preacher without a pastoral charge. If this were not the case, our local ministry is a comparatively useless arm of service. Concerning the life-long duration of the divine call to the ministry the following views are held: "As desertion is a military crime of the highest magnitude, so an abandonment of the ministerial vocation, without the clearest indication of the divine will, should be regarded as a capital error, if not a crime, against him by whom the minister was called with a holy calling, from the just claims of which nothing less than the authority of the Captain of his salvation can absolve him."—Pp. 137, 138. Yet to cease for awhile, or even for life, from the pastoral work does not involve the charge of leaving the ministry. This brings us at once to consider the case of those having charge of colleges, periodicals, and other partly secular interests, or classes of work, lying outside of the regular pastorate. A few years since, many good men thought that no minister called of God to preach the Gospel should consent to occupy the chairs of presidents or professors in colleges, or be found in editorial rooms conducting the interests of our Church literature. Experience and the evident sanction of the Lord have vastly modified such men's opinions; and now, almost by common consent, ministers are stationed at these important posts as though they belonged to the pastorate pure. But there is still a diversity of opinion as to how far a minister may labor outside of the regular appointments and work of his conference, and yet retain his conference relation. The law in the case seems clear, and reads as follows, (*vide* Dis., page [illegible]):

"He (the bishop) shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station more than three years successively, except"—and here follows the list of exceptions. In this list no mention is made of postmasters, Congressmen, or editors of unofficial papers; and hence it appears clear, if they are on the conference roll and not absolutely broken down, they are outside of their legitimate work as members of a conference, and should either locate or be located. A supernumerary's status is also clearly defined, on page 108 of the Discipline, as follows: "A supernumerary preacher is one who, because of impaired health, is temporarily unable to perform effective work. Yet, under the head of supernumeraries, we find Congressmen, and editors, and insurance or other agents, doing more hard work than any station or circuit would require. Be it understood that Dr. Kidder is not responsible for the views expressed at this point; but the writer of this article is the one to praise or blame for such opinions. In our judgment there is a growing evil right here, and proper legislation is needed to maintain the integrity of the Church and her ministers in this direction. If a minister desires to retain his conference relation, so as to vote upon the character of his brethren and assist in conference elections, and be benefited by the advantages afforded by a conference home, let him pursue the work of the ministry as far as strength will permit; but when he only holds a nominal relation to the conference and is employed in work outside of conference jurisdiction, however honorable and worthy that work may be, let him locate, and let him preach as strength will allow or opportunity offer; but let no outside work be carried on under the cloak of a nominal conference appointment. No one is to understand that any objections are offered to the holding of offices of trust or profit or honor by local preachers, but simply that members of a conference should do conference work, and not use and enjoy privileges accorded by right only to such as comply with disciplinary regulations. Indeed, it is exceedingly questionable whether the word "supernumerary" is not a misnomer, and whether the Church would not be far better off if there were but two classes of ministers entitled to a conference relation, namely, effective and superannuates. Ordained men, and men of power, are constantly needed in the local ranks; and he who cannot consent to take

an appointment at the hand of the bishop, preferring to engage in some lucrative or congenial business, should at once have his name stricken from the conference roll, and as an ordained local preacher do battle for the Lord according to his own judgment and preferences.

But we must return to the book under review, and upon examination we find the author orthodox and Methodistic with reference to class-meetings; and it would be well for the Church if ministers and members would heed the advice and instructions here given concerning so important an arm of service in our denomination. To the younger class of ministers, the chapter on the personal duties of a pastor will be of untold value. The suggestions relative to exercise and the proper kinds of recreations are to the point, or at least pointed. After mentioning the exercises indulged in by William Jay and Dr. Dempster, and stating that others have preserved their vigor by riding, walking, or rowing, the following question is propounded: "But who ever heard of such a result from a clergyman's dawdling over a game of croquet?" Echo answers: Who? It is indeed difficult to imagine our bishops, or such like men, busily engaged in driving painted balls through iron hoops with painted mallets—playing billiards on the ground. But "*De gustibus non disputandum*" will be quoted by many who love the manly sport of croquet, and the game will go on. As to the use of newspapers and books, and the plan for the distribution of the minister's time, the hints here given by our author will be of great value to the sincere inquirer after light and knowledge. Many a promising young man has been lost to the Church for want of proper teaching in his earlier ministerial days. So many of our presiding elders either cannot or will not properly instruct the "boys" placed under their care, that it becomes an imperative necessity to place such a book as "The Christian Pastorate" within reach of all, and this work should by all means be placed in the list of conference studies. There is nothing that equals it in its department.

Inasmuch as young ministers (in some cases, the younger the better) are now demanded by our city charges, it is well that a master should furnish them such hints and helps as are found in the book under notice; for not only with reference to the library and study do we find directions, but also a careful

consideration of the practical duties of the pastoral life. A faithful pastor always has a loving and faithful people; and usually a minister succeeds just in proportion as he touches the lives of his people in his every-day life. A splendid orator, a fine logician, a cultivated mind, will attract in some measure; but to attract and fasten with hooks of steel, the preacher in charge must also be a pastor. The houses must be visited, the people must be known, and their wants and wishes must be heard. Pastoral visiting, well performed, is hard work, mentally and physically. It requires exertion, skill, thought, patience, and a good degree of piety. But it pays. The various methods of performing this important work are noticed in our book, and the only one that is really effective is recommended. Many pastors resolve to visit their flocks, and then re-resolve until the year has gone, and at last find that resolutions took the place of duty performed. Many begin the work well and energetically; but finding so many persons absent, or engaged at the washtub, or with surroundings not pleasant to either pastor or housekeeper, they soon become disheartened and give over in despair. But let the pastor announce from his pulpit on the Sabbath the time and places of his calls, and request the presence of the whole family if practicable, and he will at once have a spur to urge him to duty, even though he may feel much disposed to lie in the shade or sit by his glowing grate. He will so arrange his visits that they shall, each day, all be in one neighborhood, thereby saving much travel; and he can be apprised of any expected absences, so that he will be saved unnecessary calls. In a large majority of cases he will find the family awaiting his coming with pleasure, due preparation having been made; and as all embarrassment is gone, the time allotted to his visit can be profitably spent, and the interview can usually be closed with a prayer that will avail more than a dozen prayers in the pulpit, for it is offered in a particular house, for particular persons, and to cover special wants otherwise utterly unknown to the minister.

A book relating to the work of the pastorate would be imperfect if no allusion were made to the manner of public worship, and this is fully discussed in these pages. In very many places where once the singing was spirited and spiritual, though not artistic, it is now devoid of spirit and spirituality,

but is rendered in the highest style of art. It is a really sad sight to witness the fathers and mothers, who used to help swell the gusts of praise that once swept over pew and pulpit until the waves of sacred song almost carried the congregation bodily into the presence of God, now stand through the singing of a hymn by the choir, while not a note may fall from their silent lips, for such time and tunes as choirs now use are not known to the veterans of the cross. Our service of song, in too many places, is a mere mockery, for it mocks God and mocks the people; and he who shall lead us into the proper use of this right arm of our former power will deserve the thanks of men and angels too. Our author makes suggestions and pleads manfully for the right kind of singing; but manifest destiny seems to be against us, and the world and the flesh and the devil have compelled the Ship of Zion to strike her colors, and to float at her mast-head a flag unknown to those who sailed in that staunch old vessel in the days of our fathers and mothers. *O tempora! O mores!* But we fear the days of the good old-fashioned lip and heart singing will hardly return in our day. *Hinc illæ lachrimæ.* Yet perchance a baptism of the Holy Ghost will set the Churches once more on the highway of spiritual song, over which so many have traveled who now stand on the "sea of glass mingled with fire," and "sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb!" In the matter of prayer we also need an awakening; for in how many congregations do we find the knee bowed before the Lord, or the body inclined as if in worship? Styles of dress or the arrangements of the pews oftentimes interfere with kneeling; but much oftener the spirit of devotion is wanting. When the heart is burdened, and when the desire goes out of a burdened heart for God's blessing, the knee will bow, the eye will close, the lip will move; and then, in answer to pleading prayer, the Comforter will come into the heart, filling it with joy unspeakable and full of glory. How we should plead with our congregations to show some signs of reverence, and to exhibit some desire to worship, when the throne of grace is approached by him who ministers at the altar! Here, also, our author deals plainly with the subject under consideration, and makes some valuable suggestions to the leaders of worship.

But we pass from this point to notice the radical views of our author upon a question now agitating some of our conferences. Let us quote his own words: "Not only every pastor, but every Christian minister, should be himself a pledged abstainer from every thing that intoxicates, if for no other reason than to give the weight of a consistent example on the right side. He should also be an habitual abstainer from the use of tobacco in all its forms, for the double purpose of maintaining personal purity (of the flesh and of the spirit) and of escaping the taunt of inconsistency embodied in that old rebuke, 'Physician, heal thyself.' With what effect can a smoker or a chewer of the filthy weed reprove a consumer of opium or a drinker of ardent spirits? With what confidence or hope can he preach any form of temperance or self-denial to others, when he fails to embody in his own life a consistent example of both?"—P. 506. Brave and timely words, these, and such sentiments bespeak an honest Christian minister, and our young men are safe under such a teacher if they will consent to regard his precepts. In many of our conferences no candidate is admitted who uses the weed, unless he vows to abstain hereafter: Indeed, of such importance has this question become, that, with reference to our highest Church officials, not the question, "Will the coming man drink wine?" but that other one is asked: "Will the proposed candidate, if elected, use tobacco?" If by word or work we cleanse the ministry from all filthiness of the flesh, then may we have hope of reaching with a new power our children and the world that lieth in the wicked one. From these glimpses of this book, we can readily infer that common sense, extended observation, and the fruits of much study are happily blended, making one harmonious whole that must be a lasting benefit to any and to all Churches. We must omit extended notice of the valuable suggestions relative to the pastor's wife and family, his social relations, and his relations to neighboring pastors, and close our review by commending the author's views of revivals. In these latter days we are too prone to ignore the effects of spiritual agencies in the wonderful success of the Church in former days, when revivals were every-where looked for and enjoyed; and it is refreshing to find the men having control of our theological schools fully in accord with

our standards and the time-honored sentiments of the Church. The truth is, the Church needs such a revival to-day as will thoroughly arouse her latent energies, and make her enter upon her high calling with a zeal equal to the work she is called upon to perform. A revival is needed that will affect society powerfully, and bring to life the untold thousands of very dry bones that are lying in the valley of death. We are carefully guarding our doctrines and belief against the attacks of rationalists, and are opposing true science against science falsely so called, and there can be no fault found with our strong thinkers in this direction; but it occurs to us, that if Huxley and Bain and Darwin, "*et id omne genus*," could be brought to witness such a scene as was witnessed on the day of Pentecost, and be brought to feel the breath of the Comforter as the three thousand felt it on that day, there would be a radical change in their belief and teachings. Whether science and learning will effect that change is more than doubtful. While pleading for a high standard of ministerial education, let us teach that what we need above all is a thorough revival of genuine religion. It would cleanse our Augean stables, break up our corrupt "rings," purify the political atmosphere, and usher in that day, long prayed for, when the kingdoms of this earth shall be given to the Son as his rightful possession. Let all our learning, all our wealth, and all our efforts tend to the salvation of men from sin, and the restoration of the world to the divine favor. May he whose book we have so imperfectly reviewed live to see the good results that must flow from his teachings, and be permitted to rejoice eternally with those whom he has assisted to be successful ministers of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!

We cannot close this review more appropriately than by quoting the author's closing sentences, concerning the rewards that await the faithful minister of the New Testament of the Lord Jesus Christ: "Among the felicities of the everlasting glory of the Redeemer, will be that of having shared the companionship of earthly toil and faith and suffering for the cross and kingdom of Jesus. By it the minister of the Gospel who shall have been faithful to his talent and his trust will be brought into perfected sympathy with the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs, and the accepted ministers of the truth in all

ages. While eternity can never exhaust the delights of such a companionship, it may nevertheless be made more rapturous by the harvest home of souls who shall appear as the gathered fruit of every individual's labor. Nor will the pastor then feel that his share of triumph is limited to the direct results of his personal efforts. As Christ prayed not for his disciples alone, but for those who believe on him through their word, so each Gospel laborer may expect to share in the glorious results of all the successful labors of all who are converted through his instrumentality, and that of their successors, to the end of time. But since 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God has prepared for them that love him,' how can thought conceive or tongue utter the riches or the extent of those peculiar glories which await the sincere, the zealous, the obedient and self-denying ministers of Jesus in the world to come?"

May it be our author's lot to enjoy the reward above pictured, in all its fullness and all its duration!

ART. VI.—PREVENTION AND REFORM OF JUVENILE CRIME.

It is no small matter that "Ginx's Baby" has attracted the eye of intelligent Christians and philanthropists of every shade of opinion; and although, in the marvelous diversity of sentiments as to the best course to be pursued with him, he is still exposed to no inconsiderable peril and suffering, yet is it a great point gained that the eye of the community has been fastened upon him. This forlorn infant is blessed with a powerful voice, and sooner or later he will make it to be effectually heard. He is an object of no little controversy now between Romanists and Protestants, union and sectarian boards, almshouse commissioners and children's emigration societies, street missions and permanent asylums, congregate institutions and family schools; but the controversy itself makes him so prominent an object that he cannot be covered out of sight by the smoke of the fight. He is in the newspapers; fills magazines originated in his interest; breaks in upon the mo-

notony of the stately quarterlies; and, like the memorable "Oliver" of "the Workhouse," although now one of the most conspicuous personages in modern fiction, is still clamoring, and not without success, for "more," and demands a far wider hearing. He is an admitted and terrible fact in modern civilization; and the only question for discussion now pertinent in reference to him is, "What *shall* we do with Ginx's Baby?" The community cannot long endure that condition of things which gives the stinging point of truth to the capital volume of satire bearing the expressive title which we have quoted, and which it has now permanently bestowed upon the neglected waifs of our city streets.* It is very evident that "Ginx's Baby" will not much longer plead in vain. That will not always be a true charge against British and American civilization which this author so nervously urges in his volume:

> Your dirtiest British youngster is hedged round with principles of an inviolable liberty and rights of *habeas corpus.* You let his father and mother, or any one who will save you the trouble of looking after him, mold him in his years ot tenderness as they please. If they happen to leave him a walking invalid, you take him into the poor-house; if they bring him up a thief, you whip him, and keep him at high-cost at Millbank or Dartmoor; if his passions, never controlled, break out into murder and rape, you may hang him, unless his crime has been so atrocious as to attract the benevolent interest of the Home Secretary; if he commit suicide, you hold a coroner's inquest, which costs money; and, however he dies, you give him a deal coffin and bury him. Yet I may prove to you that this being, whom you treat like a dog at a fair, never had a day's, no, nor an hour's, contact with goodness, purity, truth, or even human kindness; never had an opportunity of learning any thing better. What right have you, then, to hunt him like a wild beast, and kick him and whip him and fetter him, and hang him by expensive, complicated machinery, when you have done nothing to teach him any of the duties of a citizen?

The writer answers the natural response to his question, that there are endless means of improving the lad—industrial schools, reformatories, asylums, hospitals, Peabody buildings, laws to protect factory children—by saying, "They don't reach one out of ten;" and he continues: "I do not say it can be done; but in order to transform the next generation, what we should aim at is to provide substitutes for bad homes, evil training, unhealthy air and food, dullness and terrible ignotoriety of the stately quartettes; and, like the memorable "Oliver" of "the Workhouse," although now one of the most conspicuous personages in modern fiction, is still clamoring, and not without success, for "more," and demands a far wider hearing. He is an admitted and terrible fact in modern civilization; and the only question for discussion now pertinent in reference to him is, "What *shall* we do with Ginx's Baby?" The community cannot long endure that condition of things which gives the stinging point of truth to the capital volume of satire bearing the expressive title which we have quoted, and which it has now permanently bestowed upon the neglected waifs of our city streets.* It is very evident that "Ginx's Baby" will not much longer plead in vain. That will not always be a true charge against British and American civilization which this author so nervously urges in his volume:

---

* "Ginx's Baby." 16mo. Strahan & Co., London. Routledge & Sons, New York.

> Your dirtiest British youngster is hedged round with principles of an inviolable liberty and rights of *habeas corpus*. You let his father and mother, or any one who will save you the trouble of looking after him, mold him in his years of tenderness as they please. If they happen to leave him a walking invalid, you take him into the poor-house; if they bring him up a thief, you whip him, and keep him at high cost at Millbank or Dartmoor; if his passions, never controlled, break out into murder and rape, you may hang him, unless his crime has been so atrocious as to attract the benevolent interest of the Home Secretary; if he commit suicide, you hold a coroner's inquest, which costs money; and, however he dies, you give him a deal coffin and bury him. Yet I may prove to you that this being, whom you treat like a dog at a fair, never had a day's, no, nor an hour's, contact with goodness, purity, truth, or even human kindness; never had an opportunity of learning any thing better. What right have you, then, to hunt him like a wild beast, and kick him and whip him and fetter him, and hang him by expensive, complicated machinery, when you have done nothing to teach him any of the duties of a citizen?

The writer answers the natural response to his question, that there are endless means of improving the lad—industrial schools, reformatories, asylums, hospitals, Peabody buildings, laws to protect factory children—by saying, "They do not reach one out of ten;" and he continues: "I do not say it can be done; but in order to transform the next generation what we should aim at is to provide substitutes for bad homes, evil training, unhealthy air and food, dullness and terrible rance, in happier scenes, better teaching, proper conditions of physical life, sane amusements, and a higher cultivation." But who is to pay for all this? "The State," he answers, "which means society, the whole of which is directly interested. I tell you, a million of children are crying to us to set them free from the despotism of a crime and ignorance protected by law."

---

* "Ginx's Baby." 16mo. Strahan & Co., London. Routledge & Sons, New York.

Thus it is made evidently to appear that "Ginx's Baby" has for one of its age and circumstances a powerful voice, and will be likely to make himself heard in the long run. Mrs. Browning has caught the echo of it in her sensitive ear, and has poured it back again in affecting strains:

And well may the children weep before you!
  They are weary ere they run;
They have never seen the sunshine, nor the glory
  Which is brighter than the sun.
They know the grief of man, without his wisdom;
  They sink in man's despair, without his calm;
Are slaves without the liberty in Christdom,
  Are martyrs by the pang, without the palm,
Are worn, as if with age, yet unretrievingly,
  The harvest of its memories cannot reap,—
Are orphans of the earthly love and heavenly,
  Let them weep! let them weep!
They look up with their pale, sunken faces,
  And their look is dread to see,
For they mind you of their angels in high places,
  With eyes turned on Deity!
"How long," they say—"how long, O cruel nation,
  Will you stand to move a world on a child's heart;
Stifle down with a mailed heel its palpitation,
  And tread onward to your throne amid the mart?
Our blood splashes upward, O gold-heaper,
  And your purple shows your path!
But the child's sob in silence curses deeper
  Than the strong man in his wrath."

In 1841, in his very striking discourse upon the life and character of that eminent and successful city missionary of Boston, Dr. Joseph Tuckerman, Dr. Channing utters very much the same truth in his own quiet and eloquent style. He says:

Society has hitherto employed its energy chiefly to punish crime. It is infinitely more important to prevent it; and this I say not for the sake of those alone on whom the criminal preys.

rance, in happier scenes, better teaching, proper conditions of physical life, sane amusements, and a higher cultivation." But who is to pay for all this? "The State," he answers, "which means society, the whole of which is directly interested. I tell you, a million of children are crying to us to set them free from the despotism of a crime and ignorance protected by law."

Thus it is made evidently to appear that "Ginx's Baby" has for one of its age and circumstances a powerful voice, and will be likely to make himself heard in the long run. Mrs. Browning has caught the echo of it in her sensitive ear, and has poured it back again in affecting strains:

And well may the children weep before you!
They are weary ere they run;
They have never seen the sunshine, nor the glory
Which is brighter than the sun.
They know the grief of man, without his wisdom;
They sink in man's despair, without his calm;
Are slaves without the liberty in Christdom,
Are martyrs by the pang, without the palm,
Are worn, as if with age, yet unretrievingly,
The harvest of its memories cannot reap, —
Are orphans of the earthly love and heavenly,
Let them weep! let them weep!
They look up with their pale, sunken faces,
And their look is dread to see,
For they mind you of their angels in high places,
With eyes turned on Deity!
"How long," they say—"how long, O cruel nation,
Will you stand to move a world on a child's heart;
Stifle down with a mailed heel its palpitation,
And tread onward to your throne amid the mart?
Our blood splashes upward, O gold-heaper,
And your purple shows your path!
But the child's sob in silence curses deeper
Than the strong man in his wrath."

In 1841, in his very striking discourse upon the life and character of that eminent and successful city missionary of Boston, Dr. Joseph Tuckerman, Dr. Channing utters very much the same truth in his own quiet and eloquent style. He says:

Society has hitherto employed its energy chiefly to punish crime. It is infinitely more important to prevent it; and this I say not for the sake of those alone on whom the criminal preys.

> I do not think only or chiefly of those who suffer from crime. I plead also, and plead more, for those who perpetuate it. In moments of clear, calm thought, I feel more for the wrong-doer than for him who is wronged. In a case of theft, incomparably the most wretched man is he who steals, not he who is robbed. The innocent are not *undone* by acts of violence or fraud which they suffer. They are innocent, though injured; they do not bear the brand of infamous crime, and no language can express the import of this distinction. . . . What I want is, not merely that society should protect itself against crime, but that it shall do all it can to preserve its exposed members *from* crime, and so do for the sake of those as truly as for its own. It ought not to breed monsters in its bosom. If it will not use its prosperity to save the ignorant and poor from the blackest vice, then it must suffer, and deserves to suffer, from crime. If the child be left to grow up in utter ignorance of duty, of its Maker, of its relations to society—to grow up in an atmosphere of profaneness and intemperance, and in the practice of falsehood and fraud—let not the community complain of his crime. It has quietly looked on and seen him, year after year, arming himself against its order and peace; and who is most to blame when at last he deals the guilty blow? A moral care over the tempted and ignorant portion of the State is a primary duty of society.

Every movement for the relief of society from its fearful burdens of ignorance, poverty, and crime, has forced upon thoughtful minds the conviction, that the only solution of these problems is to be found in the application of radical remedies in the period of childhood. While prisons and almshouses and criminal law and discipline peremptorily call for reforms, and powerfully appeal to benevolent hearts, the best reform that can be secured in reference to penitentiaries and poorhouses is to deplete them of their occupants by saving the young from vicious and criminal courses.

The present site of one of the largest and most costly of the edifices in the country erected for the reformation of young delinquents, now a highly-cultivated garden, yielding to tillage large returns of fruits, vegetables, and flowers, was formerly partly an uninviting morass, in part a high, rugged rock, and in part the rough receptacle of the pauper dead; a scene unlovely to the eye and full of unwholesome miasmas. It was in its original state a significant symbol of the appearance and influence of the neglected classes in the community; while the recovery, productiveness, and healthfulness of the grounds, in their present condition, give a natural expression to the

I do not think only or chiefly of those who suffer from crime. I plead also, and plead more, for those who perpetrate it. In moments of clear, calm thought, I feel more for the wrong-doer than for him who is wronged. In a case of theft, incomparably the most wretched man is he who steals, not he who is robbed. The innocent are not undone by acts of violence or fraud which they suffer. They are innocent, though injured; they do not bear the brand of infamous crime, and no language can express the import of this distinction. . . . What I want is, not merely that society should protect itself against crime, but that it shall do all it can to preserve its exposed members *from* crime, and so do for the sake of those as truly as for its own. It ought not to breed monsters in its bosom. If it will not use its prosperity to save the ignorant and poor from the blackest vice, then it must suffer, and deserves to suffer, from crime. If the child be left to grow up in utter ignorance of duty, of its Maker, of its relations to society—to grow up in an atmosphere of profaneness and intemperance, and in the practice of falsehood and fraud—let not the community complain of his crime. It has quietly looked on and seen him, year after year, arming himself against its order and peace; and who is most to blame when at last he deals the guilty blow? A moral care over the tempted and ignorant portion of the State is a primary duty of society.

Every movement for the relief of society from its fearful burdens of ignorance, poverty, and crime, has forced upon thoughtful minds the conviction, that the only solution of these problems is to be found in the application of radical remedies in the period of childhood. While prisons and almshouses and criminal law and discipline peremptorily call for reforms, and powerfully appeal to benevolent hearts, the best reform that can be secured in reference to penitentiaries and poor-houses is to deplete them of their occupants by saving the young from vicious and criminal courses.

The present site of one of the largest and most costly of the edifices in the country erected for the reformation of young delinquents, now a highly-cultivated garden, yielding to tillage large returns of fruits, vegetables, and flowers, was formerly partly an uninviting morass, in part a high, rugged rock, and in part the rough receptacle of the pauper dead; a scene unlovely to the eye and full of unwholesome miasmas. It was in its original state a significant symbol of the appearance and influence of the neglected classes in the community; while the recovery, productiveness, and healthfulness of the grounds in their present condition, give a natural expression to the result of suitable Christian cultivation in the most unpromising moral and social soils in the land.

Perhaps the first formal movement in behalf of exposed children was inaugurated by August Hermann Francke, in the German city of Halle, in 1695. It was opened on what he calls the "goodly capital" of three dollars and a half, which had been dropped, as a subscription for the poor, in a box put up for the purpose in his house. "With this," he exclaims, "I must do a great work. I will found a school for the poor with it." Francke was a fine scholar, an eloquent preacher, welcomed at the court of Frederick William I., father of Frederick the Great, of remarkable faith and devotion, and of untiring energy. Carlyle speaks of him as of a "very mournful visage;" but this could not have been true of him. He was a marvelously cheerful, hopeful, happy man, shedding sunshine upon the many thousand children that were gathered by him into his Home and saved from ruin. From such a limited beginning, as to capital, Francke, through benefactions made to him without the solicitations of an agent, finally was enabled to pile up the largest, highest, and most imposing suite of buildings in the city of Halle, where he gathered, instructed in trades, and fitted for an honest life, thousands of orphans and street beggars. Horace Mann visited it in 1843. He describes it as a "quarter of a mile long, six stories high, several apartments thick, built round an oblong court-yard." Five hundred children are at the present time gathered within its walls, while numerous industrial and eleemosynary associations also find shelter under its many roofs.

The history of its origin and progress, written by Francke himself, bears this significant title: "The most blessed footsteps of the living and reigning and faithful God, for the shaming of the unbelieving and the strengthening of the believing, disclosed through the true and circumstantial history of the Orphan-House in Halle."

Many an earnest explorer in the unfrequented paths of philanthropy has gratefully traced, for his encouragement and inspiration, the "footsteps" left upon "the sands of time" by that friend of perishing children, August Hermann Francke. John Falk, the beloved associate of Herder and Goethe, sought out these "footsteps" a hundred years later. Falk was the result of suitable Christian cultivation in the most unpromising moral and social soils in the land.

Perhaps the first formal movement in behalf of exposed children was inaugurated by August Hermann Francke, in the German city of Halle, in 1695. It was opened on what he calls the "goodly capital" of three dollars and a half, which had been dropped, as a subscription for the poor, in a box put up for the purpose in his house. "With this," he exclaims, "I must do a great work. I will found a school for the poor with it." Francke was a fine scholar, an eloquent preacher, welcomed at the court of Frederick William I., father of Frederick the Great, of remarkable faith and devotion, and of untiring energy. Carlyle speaks of him as of a "very mournful visage;" but this could not have been true of him. He was a marvelously cheerful, hopeful, happy man, shedding sunshine upon the many thousand children that were gathered by him into his Home and saved from ruin. From such a limited beginning, as to capital, Francke, through benefactions made to him without the solicitations of an agent, finally was enabled to pile up the largest, highest, and most imposing suite of buildings in the city of Halle, where he gathered, instructed in trades, and fitted for an honest life, thousands of orphans and street beggars. Horace Mann visited it in 1842. He describes it as a "quarter of a mile long, six stories high, several apartments thick, built round an oblong court-yard." Five hundred children are at the present time gathered within its walls, while numerous industrial and eleemosynary associations also find shelter under its many roofs.

The history of its origin and progress, written by Francke himself, bears this significant title: "The most blessed footsteps of the living and reigning and faithful God, for the shaming of the unbelieving and the strengthening of the believing, disclosed through the true and circumstantial history of the Orphan-House in Halle."

Many an earnest explorer in the unfrequented paths of philanthropy has gratefully traced, for his encouragement and inspiration, the "footsteps" left upon "the sands of time" by that friend of perishing children, August Hermann Francke. John Falk, the beloved associate of Herder and Goethe, sought out these "footsteps" a hundred years later. Falk was the son of a wig-maker of Dantzic, so poor in his youth himself that he could never forget the pangs of want; so eager for learning that he read the books he borrowed by the light of the street lamps, when the weather was so cold and his fingers so numb that he could hardly turn the leaves; so devout that when sinking under the ice, which broke beneath his skates, he was saying, as he was snatched from death by his brother: "Lord Jesus, to thee I live, to thee I die; I am thine, now and for all eternity!" He was sent to college by the town council of his native city, one of the solemn and kindly old burgomasters saying to him, as he shook hands with him and gave him his blessing: "John, you are now going hence—God be with you! You will always be our debtor, for we have adopted you and affectionately cared for you as a poor child. You must not fail to repay this debt, wherever God may hereafter lead you; and whatever may be your future destination, never forget that you were once a poor boy. And when, sooner or later, some poor child knocks at your door, you must consider that it is we, the dead—the gray old burgomaster and councilors of Dantzic—who are standing there, and you must not turn us away from your door." Sure enough, these parting words were prophetic; the poor child knocked, the old burgomaster was not forgotten, and Falk's door was opened and stood open for thousands of others to follow the steps of the first wretched youth. He became a resident of Weimar, and witnessed the awful desolation which the French army under the first Napoleon brought upon Germany. (How fearfully have these sufferings been avenged before our eyes within the last few years!) Thousands of parentless children wandered begging over the country, falling into all forms of vice and crime. Pestilence came in the train of the memorable battle at Leipsic, and added to the horrors and desolations of war. Falk followed one after another of his own children to the grave, and then, rising from the depths of his household grief, he consecrated himself to the work of succoring the unprotected youth of the land. When, in 1819, his son Edward, an interesting youth of nineteen, died, the parents and remaining children sitting in tears by his lifeless body, some one knocked at the door. "O!" exclaimed the poor mother, "if I could but see you coming in the door, my poor

Edward, but once more!" A boy of fourteen came in, saying: "You have taken pity on so many poor children from our neighborhood, do take pity on me. I have had neither father nor mother since I was seven years old." The petition which began in tears ended in sobs. "O my God!" said the weeping mother, raising her eyes to heaven, "thou still sendest us the children of strangers, whom we so willingly take in, and takest away our own!"

First establishing the precedent so successfully followed in our times by Mr. Brace, in the city of New York, he instituted a society of influential and intelligent men, called "The Friends in Need," and began to carry into effect his original purpose of simply finding homes in families and in the country for the vagrant children seeking his protection. He soon saw that it was necessary to give some preliminary training to the vicious children whom he sought to rescue from certain ruin, and in 1823 he laid the foundation of the building which still remains as the best monument to his memory.

Following the same "footsteps," and continually acknowledging indebtedness to Francke and Falk, in the German-speaking portions of Europe, over four hundred institutions have been established for the succor of exposed children, having within their custody an estimated average of twelve thousand inmates. Between forty and fifty reformatory institutions have been organized in France, and two hundred and ninety-one in Great Britain. Into the British schools of reform about twenty-three thousand youths have been gathered.

Interest in behalf of the "dangerous and perishing" classes of children in England grew immediately out of the prison reforms instituted by John Howard. The most appalling sight that benevolent men and women looked upon as they entered the prisons, which had heretofore been unvisited by Christian people, were the faces of young boys and girls who were falling into fearful depths of depravity under the tuition of adult criminals. In 1818 the London Philanthropic Society was formed for their rescue, and the first British House of Refuge for exposed and criminal children was constructed in the city of London, under the supervision of such philanthropists as the Gurneys, Sir T. Fowell Buxton, and Mrs. Frye. About the same date, after correspondence and personal con-

ference with the managers of this institution, the earliest movement for the rescue of these endangered youth was undertaken in this country, in the city of New York, chiefly under the auspices of persons connected with the Society of Friends. In 1818, such men as John Griscom, Thomas Eddy, Mayor Colden, Hugh Maxwell, and James W. Gerard, united themselves in an association for the "Prevention of Pauperism." They had proceeded but a short distance in their investigations before they were convinced that little, comparatively, could be accomplished in the great field upon which they had entered, except by instituting vigorous preventive measures. Out of these careful inquiries and discussions grew the savings banks, and the admirable public school system of the city of New York. As one of the most effectual measures for breaking up chronic poverty and crime, the association resolved itself into the "Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents," and at once addressed itself to the establishment of a house of refuge. On the first day of January, 1825, on what is now Madison Square, near where stands the elegant Fifth Avenue Hotel, in a building that had been erected as barracks for soldiers, the institution was opened with appropriate services. There were some squalid children, just gathered from the streets, present on the occasion. An address was delivered by Hon. Hugh Maxwell, then district attorney, a deeply-interested manager of the house, who is still living, and is permitted to witness the amazing results which have grown out of this small beginning. He has since addressed more than a thousand children occupying the noble structure upon the Island, which is the lineal successor of the Madison Square barracks. More than thirteen thousand have been inmates of this Refuge, and from forty to fifty thousand, it is estimated, have enjoyed the instruction and discipline of the score and a half of similar institutions which have grown out of the first successful experiment.

It is an interesting fact, that one of the chief reasons urging the minds of these early friends of reform in this country to establish a house of refuge is now one of the most pressing, open, practical questions connected with the reformation of young delinquents and criminals—how to introduce again one that has cut himself off from the confidence of the community ference with the managers of this institution, the earliest movement for the rescue of these endangered youth was undertaken in this country, in the city of New York, chiefly under the auspices of persons connected with the Society of Friends. In 1818, such men as John Griscom, Thomas Eddy, Mayor Colden, Hugh Maxwell, and James W. Gerard, united themselves in an association for the "Prevention of Pauperism." They had proceeded but a short distance in their investigations before they were convinced that little, comparatively, could be accomplished in the great field upon which they had entered, except by instituting vigorous preventive measures. Out of these careful inquiries and discussions grew the savings banks, and the admirable public school system of the city of New York. As one of the most effectual measures for breaking up chronic poverty and crime, the association resolved itself into the "Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents," and at once addressed itself to the establishment of a house of refuge. On the first day of January, 1825, on what is now Madison Square, near where stands the elegant Fifth Avenue Hotel, in a building that had been erected as barracks for soldiers, the institution was opened with appropriate services. There were some squalid children, just gathered from the streets, present on the occasion. An address was delivered by Hon. Hugh Maxwell, then district attorney, a deeply-interested manager of the house, who is still living, and is permitted to witness the amazing results which have grown out of this small beginning. He has since addressed more than a thousand children occupying the noble structure upon the Island, which is the lineal successor of the Madison Square barracks. More than thirteen thousand have been inmates of this Refuge, and from forty to fifty thousand, it is estimated, have enjoyed the instruction and discipline of the score and a half of similar institutions which have grown out of the first successful experiment.

It is an interesting fact, that one of the chief reasons urging the minds of these early friends of reform in this country to establish a house of refuge is now one of the most pressing open, practical questions connected with the reformation of young delinquents and criminals—how to introduce again one that has cut himself off from the confidence of the community?

by an act of crime to virtuous society and productive labor. As long ago as 1803, when Edward Livingston, the father of legal and penitentiary reform in this country, was mayor of the city of New York, he was deeply impressed with the helpless condition of a youth leaving the prison without a trade, and without an opening for him in the community. "What can he do?" the Mayor asks. "He has no capital of his own, and that of others will not be intrusted to him; he is not permitted to labor; he dares not beg; and he is forced, for subsistence, to plunge anew into the same crime, to suffer the same punishment he has just undergone, or perhaps with more caution and address to escape it. Thus the penitentiary, instead of diminishing, may increase the number of offenses." He sought ineffectually to organize a society, or an institution, to provide forms of remunerative labor for such as these. It was as a refuge for young criminals of this class, among others, after the completion of their imprisonment, where they could learn a trade, gradually win back the confidence of employers and gain strength of purpose themselves, that Mr. Gerard recommended the construction of an institution, in the memorable public address which resulted in the establishment of the New York Reformatory. The movement, however, took upon itself more of a preventive character, and the effort was made rather to succor young children, and to prevent even their first imprisonment. At this day there are thousands of young men and women, under twenty, but over sixteen, (the normal limit of reform schools,) in penitentiaries. As these prisons are now conducted, their condition is, humanly speaking, hopeless. There are no persons outside the prison walls prepared to receive and encourage discharged prisoners in any considerable numbers, except their old criminal companions. These are ever ready to meet them as the door of the prison opens, and to proffer them shelter, food, and encouragement in a dishonest course. No counting-room, mechanics' shop, nor even farm labor, invites a young, discharged prisoner to earn an honest living. Respectable people hold themselves aloof. If the man will not starve he must steal. He is thus made a bitter enemy of society, and becomes desperate in the inevitableness of his condition. "They will all as certainly come back here, or be sent to another prison, after their discharge, as they

live," said the warden of a penitentiary a few weeks since to the writer as we stood gazing together upon a gang of a hundred or more young lads, averaging eighteen years of age, at work lazily in a stone quarry connected with the prison. "Where else can they go?" he asked. "What place has society for them, or what plan, but to train and harden them by short sentences for the highest forms of villainy?" Houses of refuge, receiving inmates from cities and permitting mature lads to be sent to their custody, meet with the same difficulty. If the youth be placed with a farmer, or even sent to the West, he almost inevitably gravitates back to the city, and, for lack of regular employment, is soon tempted to enter upon his old courses and becomes a "revolver" in the penitentiary. The old *détenues* of the Refuge, having thus lost self-respect, stand ready to seize upon such boys as they have known, or learn to have been inmates of the House, and to beguile them again into their criminal ranks. How to bridge this gulf between a moderate period of detention and a permanent position in normal life has been the last problem studied in the New York House of Refuge, as it was one of the first thoughts of some of its founders, and an encouraging approach has been made to a favorable solution. By bestowing upon this class of young men a full trade in some branch of mechanical labor, permitting them before their discharge to earn a handsome outfit, and then, through the co-operation of the contractor, (it might be secured otherwise,) affording them an opportunity for work at their trade, upon good wages, under the shadow, but not restraint, of the institution, two most desirable results have been obtained. First, a marked inspiration has been manifest throughout the ranks of the older boys, and especially among those who, from *oinomania*, *kleptomania*, or sexual helplessness, have been sure to become the victims of street temptations. The prospect of accomplishing something in an honest line has awakened unwonted hope and ambition within them. In the second place, quite a number of second and third comers, lads who had been inmates of penitentiaries, very hard and unpromising cases, are now coming daily to their work, having decent boarding places, and are restrained from their old temptations by the moral forces around them and the encouragement of good wages. This promises to be one of the most hopeful measures five," said the warden of a penitentiary a few weeks since to the writer as we stood gazing together upon a gang of a hundred or more young lads, averaging eighteen years of age, at work lazily in a stone quarry connected with the prison. "Where else can they go?" he asked. "What place has society for them, or what plan, but to train and harden them by short sentences for the highest forms of villainy?" Houses of refuge, receiving inmates from cities and permitting mature lads to be sent to their custody, meet with the same difficulty. If the youth be placed with a farmer, or even sent to the West, he almost inevitably gravitates back to the city, and, for lack of regular employment, is soon tempted to enter upon his old courses and becomes a "revolver" in the penitentiary. The old *détenues* of the Refuge, having thus lost self-respect, stand ready to seize upon such boys as they have known, or learn to have been inmates of the House, and to beguile them again into their criminal ranks. How to bridge this gulf between a moderate period of detention and a permanent position in normal life has been the last problem studied in the New York House of Refuge, as it was one of the first thoughts of some of its founders, and an encouraging approach has been made to a favorable solution. By bestowing upon this class of young men a full trade in some branch of mechanical labor, permitting them before their discharge to earn a handsome outfit, and then, through the co-operation of the contractor, (it might be secured otherwise,) affording them an opportunity for work at their trade, upon good wages, under the shadow, but not restraint, of the Institution, two most desirable results have been obtained. First, a marked inspiration has been manifest throughout the ranks of the older boys, and especially among those who, from *oinomania*, *kleptomania*, or sexual helplessness, have been sure to become the victims of street temptations. The prospect of accomplishing something in an honest line has awakened unwonted hope and ambition within them. In the second place, quite a number of second and third comers, lads who had been inmates of penitentiaries, very hard and unpromising cases, are now coming daily to their work, having decent boarding places, and are restrained from their old temptations by the moral forces around them and the encouragement of good wages. This promises to be one of the most hopeful measures for diminishing the number of those who, in spite of the lessons of the Refuge, are borne down by the tide of evil influences sweeping through the streets of our cities. The true work of a reformatory is as verily to be performed outside as within its walls. It may not retain, for an undue time, an inmate within its immediate discipline; but it should always follow him with kindly supervision, and strive for his redemption, by many trials if necessary, as does the true parent, in whose place it stands. Its open doors, during his minority, should ever be his welcome shelter in all hours of peculiar temptation growing out of want.

During the quarter of a century succeeding the establishment of the New York institution, but few houses of refuge were opened in the country. Boston was the first, in 1826, to follow its example, and Philadelphia in 1828. It was not until 1835 that the interesting private Farm School for orphans and poor children was opened in the city of Boston, and afterward removed to Thompson's Island, in the harbor; and it was as recently as 1847 that the State Reform School at Westborough, Mass., began to receive its inmates. It was nearly ten years after this before these institutions began to multiply in various portions of the country.

The New York and Boston institutions attracted, in their early years, much attention on this continent and in Europe. They were both of them particularly favored in their first superintendents, who were men of original and marked abilities—Rev. Mr. Wells in Boston, and Messrs. Curtis and Hart in New York. They were scholarly men, of great personal magnetism, drawing their young families to themselves by an almost irresistible force, and greatly impressing American and foreign visitors by their reformatory power over them. There was no discussion at that early day in reference to the style of buildings or the systems of discipline, save that the latter should be chiefly moral rather than corporal, and should meet the young new-comer with a face of love rather than with a frown, and impress them rather with its mercy than its power of retribution. The earnest managers of those days took such edifices as they could obtain by the gift of the city or from individuals, and provided the best accommodations their limited means permitted. They depended rather upon intellectual,

industrial, and moral measures, and the personal assimilation of character through the agency of Christian officers and teachers, than upon material facilities. If we can rely upon the statistics of those days, we have gained but little upon them in permanent moral results. What we have secured in pecuniary endowments, noble edifices, and generous appliances, we may possibly have lost, in a degree, in enthusiastic earnestness and self-denying devotion on the part of those to whom these important institutions are intrusted.

The first institutions were constituted by benevolent individuals subscribing freely of their means, and obtaining an act of incorporation giving them legal authority over their inmates. The management was perpetuated by annual elections among themselves, without political interference, the State simply granting yearly subsidies and requiring an annual report. These institutions have been far more successful, useful, and peaceful than such of their successors as have been purely State institutions, with their trustees appointed by the executive authority, and their officers, as a consequence, constantly exposed to changes. In almost every instance of this class, at some period of its history, serious embarrassments have resulted from this policy, and the usefulness of the institution has been often greatly periled.

The true policy of the State is, by a general law like that of Great Britain, to allow a reasonable sum *per capita* to all public institutions for reform, and to encourage philanthropic men and women every-where to multiply such houses, thus developing the noblest traits and sacrifices on the part of its citizens, and bringing the opportunities of reformation into all the exposed quarters of the land. By a careful supervision, and by requiring a certain standard of sanitary, educational, industrial, and moral facilities, the State may easily be defended from any abuse of its charity.

The reports of Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, and of Dr. Calvin E. Stowe of visits to the very interesting and successful institution established by Dr. John Henry Wichern, in 1833, at Hamburg, Germany, of its embowered but plainly-built cottages, containing families of twelve boys or girls each, with workshops, school-house, and church, and the remarkable results which this learned and

devoted man and his warm-hearted mother had attained with some of the most depraved street-boys of the city, awakened fresh interest in the work of juvenile reform. The two valuable volumes of Miss Mary Carpenter, of Bristol, England, upon the causes and cure of juvenile delinquency, presenting the attractive picture of the agricultural colony for boys at Mettray, in France, established under the supervision of Judge De Metz, with its separate houses for twenty boys, without walls or bars or locks, as well as new illustrations of the discipline of the Rauhe Haus under Wichern, and the imitation of the continental schools by England at Red Hill, with a full discussion of the various difficult questions involved in the training of this class of young persons, confirmed the enthusiasm awakened in many benevolent minds in reference to the reformation of young criminals and the rescue of exposed children. In 1853, the Board of Managers of the Philadelphia House of Refuge offered a premium of one hundred dollars for the best essay, and fifty dollars for the next in excellence, upon juvenile delinquency. Forty-four papers were presented, and three of them were published. The highest prize was given to Rev. Edward Everett Hale, and his essay upon the State's care of its children was particularly suggestive and impressive. The others, by Bishop Moore, of Virginia, and by an anonymous writer, approached the subject from different points, and showed how widely extended and profound was the impression that the State was not meeting its paramount obligations to its exposed and criminal youths. Just at this time, the Legislature of Massachusetts appointed a commission of learned and practical gentlemen to prepare a plan and a law for the establishment of a proposed school of reform for delinquent girls. They entered into an extensive correspondence, and presented, in 1855, to the Legislature a very full and valuable report upon the subject. They settled upon what has since been called the "family plan," breaking up the institution into separate homes of thirty girls each with their three matrons, all united under the general supervision of a male superintendent. The title of Industrial School was afterward given to it, to relieve the after-life of the inmates from any stain arising from a penal name; and upon the system proposed by the commissioners it was constructed at Lancaster,

Mass., and has been administered there for about sixteen years. It forms a pretty village scene, with its neat homes, its white-spired church, and its merry children sporting on its grounds. Nearly at the same time, Ohio commissioned thoughtful and benevolent men to elaborate a system for a State reform institution for boys. They were strongly impressed with the Massachusetts law and system of discipline, and, having made themselves familiar with the noted European establishments, they arranged the well-known State Farm at Lancaster, Ohio, with its family houses bearing their melodious names, and its novel system, in this country, of elder brothers. The conventions of managers and superintendents of reformatory institutions, held in the city of New York in 1857 and 1859, afforded favorable opportunities for practical laborers and the advanced students in the field of juvenile reform to present and compare opinions.

These various public demonstrations in behalf of exposed and criminal children were not without their natural results. Active measures—hindered indeed somewhat, but not prevented, by the war—were instituted throughout the Northern and Western States for the establishment of State and voluntary institutions for the rescue of the young. It is difficult to obtain a full report of the smaller establishments, and thus secure a clear idea of what really is doing throughout the country in this direction. Quite a number of new institutions are already projected and are in the process of construction. The "family plan," so called, generally prevails in some modified form in the later institutions, and the sexes are trained in different schools. About the same standard of education is attained in all these Houses of Reform. The same high average as to health and low average as to the death rate, and much the same results as to the reformation of their subjects, according to such statistical tables as have been secured, seem to be reached by the majority of these institutions. But it is quite impossible satisfactorily to compare the institutions with each other. Some have younger children; some reject very hard cases; some have only such cases committed to their custody, juvenile and orphan asylums in their vicinity and children's aid societies skimming the more promising street boys for their discipline and distribution, and leaving the poorest

quality, physically and morally, for the House of Refuge; some retain their children six months, some one year, and some three; some keep a carefully-written record, and others base their moral statistics upon general impressions. There are no positive facts which enable a thoughtful person to form a safe judgment of the moral and permanent advantages which one system of juvenile discipline has over another. In many instances repeated changes in administration and inefficient men have rendered a good system helpless to work out its possible results among the inmates of a reform school. In some cases, as in the city of New York, the magistrates constantly yield to the importunity of parents, or the demands of persons having political influence, and by the occasion of flaws in warrants, or other ready devices in the use of the writ of *habeas corpus*, interrupt the efforts of managers to reform vicious youths, and rarely afford them support in withholding children from miserable homes and obtaining for them the wholesome training of the country farm or workshop.

Without doubt, however, every institution is working out benign results, and is constantly correcting its own practical mistakes. We are disposed to criticise each other somewhat severely, because no "power" has bestowed upon us the gift to see ourselves as others see us. After all our criticism, however, one class of mind works most freely and successfully under one system, and another under a different. If the great end of reforming youth is gained, by whatever humane and Christian plan it is attained, we will not enter into discouraging controversy with the reformers as to their measures.

The universal want in these institutions is a class of better educated and more devoted subordinate officers. Every person coming near these children should be an example of the Christian virtues, have special intelligence, and be of a reforming mind. The superintendents, taken as a whole, are a superior class of men. But ignorant men, and sometimes immoral men, because the salary paid for the position they occupy is small, are found in the lower offices. The oath or sneer in the hall or yard will do more injury than the chaplain can overcome in the pulpit.

Almost all of the institutions suffer for lack of well-arranged, remunerative, and somewhat brisk and hard work. This is quality, physically and morally, for the House of Refuge; some retain their children six months, some one year, and some three; some keep a carefully-written record, and others base their moral statistics upon general impressions. There are no positive facts which enable a thoughtful person to form a safe judgment of the moral and permanent advantages which one system of juvenile discipline has over another. In many instances repeated changes in administration and inefficient men have rendered a good system helpless to work out its possible results among the inmates of a reform school. In some cases, as in the city of New York, the magistrates constantly yield to the importunity of parents, or the demands of persons having political influence, and by the occasion of flaws in warrants, or other ready devices in the use of the writ of *habeas corpus*, interrupt the efforts of managers to reform vicious youths, and rarely afford them support in withholding children from miserable homes and obtaining for them the wholesome training of the country farm or workshop.

Without doubt, however, every institution is working out benign results, and is constantly correcting its own practical mistakes. We are disposed to criticise each other somewhat severely, because no "power" has bestowed upon us the gift to see ourselves as others see us. After all our criticism, however, one class of mind works most freely and successfully under one system, and another under a different. If the great end of reforming youth is gained, by whatever humane and Christian plan it is attained, we will not enter into discouraging controversy with the reformers as to their measures.

The universal want in these institutions is a class of better educated and more devoted subordinate officers. Every person coming near these children should be an example of the Christian virtues, have special intelligence, and be of a reforming mind. The superintendents, taken as a whole, are a superior class of men. But ignorant men, and sometimes immoral men, because the salary paid for the position they occupy is small, are found in the lower offices. The oath or sneer in the hall or yard will do more injury than the chaplain can overcome in the pulpit.

Almost all of the institutions suffer for lack of well-arranged, remunerative, and somewhat brisk and hard work. This is indispensable in reform schools for boys and girls. Other vital elements being present—such as sanitary, educational, and moral forces—the success of a reformatory institution will be measured by its wisdom in arranging its industrial discipline. The forms of labor chosen should be those that bring reasonable pecuniary returns—work that may hereafter be followed by the inmate as a trade; it should be allotted in the form of stints, not too severe, to encourage rapid labor, a lengthened period of play rewarding diligence at work; it should stand in some way related to the hour of discharge, so that the inmate will be constantly inspired to improve at his tasks; and at a certain stage it is very desirable that he should share in the pecuniary results of his work.

Effort enough is not put forth to follow and succor the child after its discharge from the Refuge, and to renew the work of reform at the school when it is necessary. The true and full influence of a reformatory cannot be safely measured by the social condition of the youth in the first years after his discharge. His falling into temptation again, and sinking back into a penitentiary even, does not prove that his training received in the Refuge has been inefficient or is lost. Do we give up all hope of an intemperate man, struggling to reform, who stumbles once, or even twice? The writer has known of repeated cases where boys from a reform school have fallen into crime, and within the cells of a prison have recalled their former instructions, and have taken courage to attempt again a virtuous life and have succeeded. We have had young men in the penitentiary seek the opportunity of coming back to the old home again, and trying once more its encouraging discipline. Even in the case of a young man executed for murder committed in an hour of drunkenness, his penitence, his humility, his proper view of the turpitude of his conduct, his remorse that he had not lived as he was counseled when an inmate of the Refuge, gave undoubted evidence that the whole effect of the moral lessons he had received was not lost.

Some institutions are too indulgent and some too exacting. Absolute justice and kindness secure more contentment among the inmates than constant coaxing and amusement. Facts show, in spite of theories, that walls and securely-closed doors do not depress nor discourage youths of an age suitable to be

committed to a reform school, do not unfavorably affect the health nor destroy buoyancy of spirit; but they do allay the Arab fever in the veins of street children, and the demoralizing meditations upon possible plans of escape.

While the farm offers the most wholesome discipline in many respects, and it is very desirable to send away vagrant boys from the city into the country, there are many that will not remain upon a farm, that need for their discipline the more active training of the shop, and who give a far better promise of being rescued from the temptations of the streets if they have a remunerative mechanical trade. Besides, many months in the year the farm offers little work for these institution boys to perform. The shop and the ship are the great promising openings for them.

It is still, however, the era of experiment, and the newer institutions are coming upon the field with the accumulated wisdom of a half-century's trial to aid them at the start. The great leverage of loss still in these establishments, the fall of so many that have enjoyed their instructions, shows that there is work still for thinkers and executive minds to busy their thoughts upon.

While the reform schools have been multiplying, the work of prevention has been carried on with an equal pace. The remarkable success of Dr. Chalmers in Glasgow, in 1820, in carrying the day-school and religious institutions into the most vicious and degraded portions of the city, and changing the whole physical appearance of the vicinity as well as the moral character of the inhabitants, and the repetition of the experiment in Edinburgh in 1845, in streets to which Burke by numerous murders had given an infamous notoriety—where one fourth of the population were on the poor-roll as paupers, and another fourth were known to be street-beggars, thieves, or prostitutes—awakened general interest. Within five years, by the introduction of the simplest form of religious and intellectual culture, the whole character of that locality in Edinburgh was changed. So practicable and effectual was the work, that in this short period it was not known that a single child of a family resident within the "West Port" was habitually absent from school; and from being a dangerous neighborhood, day and night, it became one of the most orderly and

safest quarters of the city. The success also of Sheriff Watson, in the Scotch city of Aberdeen, in clearing all the streets of young vagrants, by supplying plain clothing, food, and instruction in suitable institutions, and requiring all children found in the streets without regular employment to attend upon them at the peril of being committed to the penitentiary, and of the English ragged-schools, originated by that remarkable cripple-shoemaker, John Pounds, of Portsmouth, in his experiment with his "little blackguards," as he called them, inspired Christian men and women on this side of the Atlantic to explore the dark wastes of vice in our large cities, and carry with them the resources of the Gospel and opportunities for intellectual and industrial training. What transformations have taken place in the Five Points and Fourth Ward of New York, in Bedford-street, Philadelphia, and in North-street, Boston! The moral wilderness and the solitary places have been made glad by the presence of devoted men and women; the wolf has been made to dwell with the lamb, and a little child has led them.

One of the most thoroughly organized preventive measures of the day is the extended system of the Children's Aid Society in New York, embracing temporary lodgings for little street merchants, day and evening industrial schools, and a constant vigorous deportation of the vagrant youths of the city streets to those portions of the country where the pressing demands for even juvenile labor secure for these "little wanderers" a comfortable home and an agricultural training. The past twenty years have witnessed the rapid increase of orphan institutions, Magdalene asylums, city and midnight missions, and almost every conceivable variety of associated effort to carry the blessing of the Gospel to the dangerous and perishing classes. There is, doubtless, a great want of economy in this multiplication of agencies with paid agents. It is not altogether an unfounded taunt on modern philanthropy that it is made to cost two dollars to give a needy person one. There is a special demand at this hour for some central board in States or municipalities to systematize and harmonize these multiform agencies; but after all these obvious evils are admitted, it must be said that their very multitudinousness calls the greater number of workers into the field, and secures a wider exploration

of the seats and nests of vice and crime, the breaking up of which will be one of the most important and successful steps toward depleting our prisons and decreasing the criminal class. We bid God-speed to all these thousands of laborers in the great common field. Their efforts will disclose their efficiency in the transformations they secure. They will

> "Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
> Ring out the narrowing lust for gold,
> Ring out the thousand ways of old;
> Ring in the thousand years of peace,
> Ring in the valiant man and free,
> The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
> Ring out the darkness of the land,
> Ring in the Christ that is to be."

ART. VII.—HOMER AND HIS ENGLISH TRANSLATORS.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

In a previous article we examined the earlier translations of Homer into English verse. In the present one we shall devote our attention to the more recent translations of Lord Derby and Mr. Bryant, whose intrinsic merits, no less than their comparative freshness, entitle them to a fuller discussion as well as a careful collation.

It is not too much to assert, that among all the earlier complete translations of either the Iliad or the Odyssey, not one was felt to be wholly satisfactory. Chapman's Homer was too capricious, Ogilby's too tame. Hobbes, of Malmesbury, had given us a poem, the chief peculiarity of which was its baldness. Cowper had constructed verses conspicuously deficient in harmony; while none of the more modern writers—neither Sotheby nor Munford nor any of their rivals—possessed the combination of skill in the use of language and a keen appreciation of the spirit of the author demanded by their office. Although sound scholarship and scrupulous fidelity were felt to be needed worthily to reproduce the immortal poems of Homer, it was none the less evident that the old adage held good in this case also—It requires a poet fully to comprehend and translate a poet. And so it was that, until lately, in spite of all his glaring deficiencies, Alexander Pope was still the

accepted interpreter of Homer. That he is no longer admitted to this high place, even in the estimation of the general public, is due entirely to Lord Derby and Mr. Bryant, who, on opposite sides of the Atlantic, have made the most painstaking and brilliant attempts to present us with an English Homer disfigured by no additions of strange and incongruous costume. And it is a matter of proper national pride that, in whatever light we compare the results of their efforts, it will be found that the palm of superior success incontestably belongs to our own American poet.

In the spring of 1862, Edward, Earl of Derby, for the gratification of a few personal friends, published in a volume of "Translations of Poems, Ancient and Modern," the first book of the Iliad. The flattering reception of this first attempt encouraged the author to employ such leisure as he could command, amid his engrossing political engagements, to the continuation of the work. At the close of 1864 he had completed his self-imposed task, and gave to the public the entire poem. He wrote in his preface:

> It has been my aim throughout to produce a translation, and not a paraphrase; not, indeed, such a translation as would satisfy with regard to each word the rigid requirements of accurate scholarship, but such as would fairly and honestly give the sense and spirit of every passage and of every line, omitting nothing and expanding nothing, and adhering, as closely as our language will allow, ever to every epithet which is capable of being translated, and which has in the particular passage anything of a special and distinctive character.

It speaks well for the sound judgment of Lord Derby, that he seems promptly to have rejected the various meters which his predecessors in this work had severally adopted—the complicated Spenserian stanza, the trochaic or ballad measure, the rhyming couplet, and the hexameter, which, artificial in German, even in the hands of Voss, becomes absolutely unendurable when pressed into the service of English versification. Applied to a language in which the verbal accent, the only basis for rhythm it possesses, abhors the long intervals required by the dactyl, and, if it falls far back in the word, almost uniformly necessitates the introduction of a secondary or auxiliary accent in every alternate syllable, this English hexameter is a monstrosity, totally different in type from the Greek and Latin

hexameters. On the other hand, the grand decasyllabic iambic verse, the verse of Milton's immortal epics, in which that master writer, who, whether in prose or in poetry, knew scarce an equal, certainly no superior, sang

> Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden—

the verse which, accordingly, has as good a claim to be called heroic in English as has the dactylic hexameter in Greek, presented itself as eminently appropriate. Lord Derby's panegyric of this species of verse, the heritage of our common Anglo-Saxon tongue, is so fine, and at the same time so well-deserved, that we cannot but give it a place here, extended though it is:

> In the progress of this work I have been more and more confirmed in the opinion which I expressed at its commencement, that (whatever may be the extent of my own individual failure) "if justice is ever to be done to the easy flow and majestic simplicity of the grand old poet, it can only be in the heroic blank verse." I have seen isolated passages admirably rendered in other meters; and there are many instances in which a translation line for line and couplet for couplet naturally suggests itself, and in which it is sometimes difficult to avoid an involuntary rhyme; but the blank verse appears to me the only meter capable of adapting itself to all the gradations, if I may use the term, of the Homeric style, from the finished poetry of the numerous similes, in which every touch is nature and nothing is overcolored or exaggerated, down to the simple, almost homely, style of some portions of the narrative. Least of all can any other meter do full justice to the spirit and freedom of the various speeches in which the old warriors give utterance, without disguise or restraint, to all their strong and genuine emotions. To subject these to the trammels of couplet and rhyme would be as destructive of their chief characteristics as the application of a similar process to the "Paradise Lost" of Milton or the tragedies of Shakspeare; the effect, indeed, may be seen by comparing with some of the noblest speeches of the latter the few couplets which he seems to have considered himself bound by custom to tack on to their close at the end of a scene or an act.*

The execution of the translation, conceived with such just views so far as regards its form, is deserving of very high praise. One or two things will at once strike the reader,

---

* Preface, p. 7, etc.

especially if he come to it fresh from the perusal of the earlier versions. In the first place he will discover, before he has gone very far, that if art has been employed in the construction of the sentences it is an art that conceals art. The flow is steady, the versification smooth. There is nothing abrupt; there are no impediments in the way, no rough spots to withdraw the eye from the view of scene after scene of rare beauty and attractiveness. In an eminent degree Lord Derby's Homer possesses the highest merit which can attach to literary composition, that of rarely fixing attention upon itself either by falling below the proper dignity of the subject or by an attempt at meretricious display. The diction is clear and transparent. Now this is very different from the older translations, and especially from that of Cowper, which, being in blank verse, affords the most convenient basis of comparison. Of the latter you can hardly read five lines anywhere without stumbling upon a defective rhythm, caused, it is not unlikely, by the false and unnatural accent which the verse requires you to place upon some properly unaccented syllable. Closely connected with this is another fact which the comparison will infallibly bring into view. The involved constructions of Cowper find no place in Derby. To exemplify both the transparent diction and the simple but dignified construction of the discourse in Lord Derby's translation, read his rendering of the characteristic speech of Telamonian Ajax to Ulysses in the hearing of the obdurate hero, whom he wished to shame into returning to his post in the Greek army (*Iliad* IX, 724, etc.):

> "We needs must bear
> Our tidings, all unwelcome as they are,
> Back to the chiefs awaiting our return.
> Achilles hath allowed his noble heart
> To cherish rancor and malignant hate;
> Nor recks he of his old companions' love,
> Wherewith we honored him above the rest
> Relentless he! a son's or brother's death,
> By payment of a fine, may be atoned;
> The slayer may remain in peace at home,
> The debt discharged; the other will forego,
> The forfeiture received, his just revenge;
> But in thy breast the gods have placed a soul
> Implacable and harsh: and for a girl,
> A simple girl! and seven we offer thee
> Surpassing fair, and other gifts to boot.

> We now bespeak thy courtesy; respect
> Thy hearth; remember that beneath thy roof
> We stand, selected by the gen'ral voice
> From all the host; and fain would claim to be,
> Of all the Greeks, thy best and dearest friends."

It has often been remarked of Homer's style, that the poet rarely takes up a new topic without first fully dismissing that of which he has been treating, and that thus each line presents a distinct image to the mind's eye. Yet so naturally and simply are the lines linked together, so skillfully is one image made to vanish and give place to its successor, that the attention of the reader rarely flags, his mind scarcely ever tires. In this particular Homer finds a close and successful imitator in Lord Derby. His style is natural and unstudied; and as it is against his avowed purpose either to insert any thing which he does not find in Homer, or to omit what he does find there, he is saved the absurdity of crediting the Greek poet with conceits and refinements which were utterly foreign to the age in which he lived. An able writer in the Edinburgh Review,* more familiar with Lord Derby's public speeches than we are, believes that he can trace in his phraseology not a little of the oratorical power which rendered him a very distinguished man in political life; and he thinks that the merits of his translation of the Iliad "may be summed up in one word—that it is eminently *attractive;* it is instinct with life; it may be read with fervent interest; and though it does not rival Pope in the charms of versification, it is immeasurably nearer than Pope to the text of the original. If we ask ourselves," he continues, "whence these qualities are derived, we suspect it is from the living interest and individuality Lord Derby has thrown into his work. Cowper was a more perfect master of English blank verse than Lord Derby, yet his translation of Homer is cold and repulsive, and of the numerous experiments which have been made in our own time not one could support the ordeal of a second reading."

After the Earl of Derby had given us so correct and spirited a version—the best, take it all in all, that had appeared in English up to his time—it could scarcely have been anticipated that a new and formidable rival would soon enter the

---

* For January, 1865.

field. Just about the time that Lord Derby was committing to the press his Homer, William Cullen Bryant began writing his. The occupation which Hobbes, of Malmesbury, entered upon as a recreation for old age, and Cowper in the desperate attempt to ward off that fearful melancholy which threatened to unsettle his reason, became to Mr. Bryant, as he briefly informs us in his preface, a means of "helping him in some measure to divert his mind from a great domestic sorrow."

It would be quite superfluous to undertake here the enumeration of the advantages which the new translator of Homer seemed to possess, and which raised high the expectations of the American, and, perhaps, scarcely less the English, public, as soon as it was known that he was devoting some of his maturer years to the task. Few men in their prime have written verses that will compare with those which the author of Thanatopsis composed at eighteen. With a mind imbued with an almost idolatrous love of nature, he never forgot the impressions gained in childhood among the hills of Massachusetts, or lost in the busy city where his life has been principally spent the repose and calm which he had acquired in communion with the grandest works of God around him. The "Forest Hymn" breathes the same unaffected devotion to the wild haunts of wood and field as the earliest of his published poems. But not alone as the interpreter of nature had Mr. Bryant won an enviable distinction. His numerous translations from the Spanish and the German, from the French and the Portuguese, had shown how well his muse could comprehend and reproduce the poetic thoughts and expressions of others.

It would be impracticable, if it were desirable, within the limits to which we are confined, to institute that minute comparison between Mr. Bryant's version of the Iliad and Odyssey and the productions of his predecessors upon which alone a comprehensive estimate of their respective merits can be based. It would be unjust to those preliminary attempts to ignore the great advantage which Bryant has enjoyed in possessing such valuable guides, who, whether by their success or by their failures, have equally contributed to lighten his task. Nor has Mr. Bryant himself been slow in acknowledging, to use his own words, "that although Homer is, as Cowper has well observed, the most perspicuous of poets, he has been some

times, perhaps often, guided by the labors of his predecessors to a better mode of dealing with certain refractory passages of his author than he would otherwise have found." We cannot discover, however, that the assistance has been too great or too frequently invoked. Of verbal coincidences there must, of course, be many. In epithets and designations, the room for choice being extremely limited, this is unavoidable, especially when to identity of subject and of author there is added, as in the case of Derby, the same meter and poetic form. On the whole, we are surprised at the infrequency, rather than at the number, of these parallelisms, when we consider that both Derby and Bryant have laid down for themselves so strict a rule of conscientious accuracy of translation.

We might select, for such a partial comparison between the translations of Lord Derby and Mr. Bryant as the limits of this article will allow, the commencement of the third book of the Iliad. It will be remembered that this passage, although not specially remarkable for its poetic fire, is of considerable interest as picturing in Homer's best style the short-lived valor of Paris, his cowardly retreat upon the approach of Menelaus, Hector's taunting reproof of his effeminate brother's weakness and treachery, and Paris's final proposition to settle the entire quarrel by a single encounter between himself and Menelaus.

The hosts marshaled for war approach. The Trojan advancing "with noise and clamor," as Derby expresses it—"with shouts and clang of arms," as Bryant renders it more precisely (*κλαγγῇ τ' ἐνοπῇ*)—is likened to the cranes that fly southward and bear to the race of pygmies *φόνον καὶ* Κῆρα, which our American translator again gives exactly, "bloodshed and death," not "battle and death," as Derby makes it. All goes well with Paris, the fresh champion of Troy, until he espies the Grecian hero, whose hospitality he has so grievously violated, approaching *in*, not *from*, the foremost ranks, as both translators make it. But at the sight of his injured host Paris draws back in terror. Homer compares his fright to that of one who comes unexpectedly upon a serpent:

> *Ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδών, παλίνορσος ἀπέστη*
> *Οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς, ὑπό τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα, κ. τ. λ.*

> "As one who meets within a mountain glade
> A serpent starts aside with sudden fright;

And takes the backward way with trembling limb
And cheeks all white."

This rendering of Bryant's is about as faithful as it is possible to make one in translating verse into verse, and certainly is as precise as can be required. It is exact even to those details which the older translators thought themselves at liberty to modify or change at will. In fact, it is exact where Derby allows himself more latitude. With him it is a "traveler," and the scene is not a "glade" (*βῆσσαι*) but a "mountain-side." The serpent becomes a "deadly" snake, and is represented as "coiled in his path," an addition the more unfortunate as the participle jars upon the ear in such close proximity with the verb "recoils" of the next line. Paris withdraws into the ranks of the "high-souled sons of Troy," as Bryant renders *ἀγχερώων* Τρώων, while Derby omits the epithet altogether.

And so in a great number of minute particulars, in themselves perhaps of no great importance, but gaining importance collectively from the fact that they are so many touches which reproduce the coloring of Homer's painting. It is Bryant that is particularly impressed with the view that not one of them must be arbitrarily left out, and that, other things being equal, that form of translation is best which copies the original even down to the most apparently insignificant detail. Hector did more than "speak in stern rebuke" to his recreant brother—*νείκεσσεν . . . αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν*—he "upbraided him harshly." A little further on he asks him—not as Derby gives his words, "How was't that such as thou could e'er induce" the Trojans to follow and carry off fair Helen from Greece? but as Bryant properly gives it—

"Wast thou such
When, crossing the great deep in thy staunch ships,
With chosen comrades, thou didst make thy way
Among a stranger people, and bear off
A beautiful woman from that distant land?"

The figure with which Hector's spirited address concluded is, however, better given by Derby:

"But too forbearing are the men of Troy;
Else for the ills that thou hast wrought the State,
Ere now thy body *had in stone been cased*."—(Lines 66-8.)

Bryant makes the threat read:

> "Else hadst thou, for the evil thou hast wrought,
> Been laid *beneath a coverlet of stone*," (lines 70–1;)

which is evidently not so good. Hector's meaning was plainly: Instead of the armor of bronze which now clothes thee, thou shouldst have had another armor encasing thee, but it would have been the stony armor of the sepulcher. In the original it is not a *coverlet*, but a *tunic*, of stone—

> *ἦ τέ κεν ἤδη*
> *λάϊνον ἕσσο χιτῶνα, κακῶν ἕνεχ', ὅσσα ἔοργας.*

In the seventy-eighth and seventy-ninth lines Derby employs the circumlocution "Heaven" for "the gods"—a circumlocution which is certainly not Homeric and ought to be avoided, as it smacks of Pope and his imitators. In the eighty-fourth and others, the *κτήματα* which Paris offers to restore to Menelaus, should the latter prevail in the proposed duel, are the rich possessions, the "treasure," which Paris had carried off when he robbed Menelaus of his wife, and, therefore, improperly translated by Derby, "the spoils of war."

We are not warranted in supposing that Homer employs the proper names Achaia and Argos indifferently to designate the same territory, especially when they occur in the same connection. So when the Greeks are to return—

> *Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιΐδα καλλιγύναικα*—

Bryant is wise in rendering:

> "And all the Greeks
> Return to Argos, famed for noble steeds,
> And to Achaia, famed for lovely dames;"

rather than confuse them as Derby does:

> "And to their native Argos they return,
> For noble steeds and lovely women famed."—(Lines 90–1.)

At line one hundred and ten Bryant, on the other hand, omits altogether the designation which Hector characteristically gives to Paris as *τοῦ εἵνεκα νεῖκος ὄρωρεν*, while Derby renders it properly:

> "Hear now, ye Trojans and ye well-greaved Greeks,
> The words of Paris, *cause of all this war*."—(Lines 103–4.)

Very rarely, however, does the credit of observing the niceties of translation belong to Derby rather than Bryant. Only two or three lines further down, the latter distinguishes Menelaus

as "loved of Mars," while the former confounds him with the common herd of the "warlike."

We may be pardoned for presenting, side by side, a brief extract from each of the two translations of the same passage, as affording a more ready means of comparing their respective merits both on the score of fidelity and on that of poetical execution.

Here is Lord Derby's version of the beginning of Menelaus's acceptance of the challenge:

> "Hear now my answer: in this quarrel I
> May claim the chiefest share; and now I hope
> Trojans and Greeks may see the final close
> Of all the labors ye so long have borne
> T' avenge my wrong, at Paris' hand sustained.
> And of us two, whiche'er is doomed to death,
> So let him die! the rest, depart in peace.
> Bring then two lambs, one white, the other black,
> For Tellus and for Sol; we, on our part,
> Will bring another, for Saturnian Jove."

Mr. Bryant's is as follows:

> "Now hear me also—me whose spirit feels
> The wrong most keenly. I propose that now
> The Greeks and Trojans separate reconciled,
> For greatly have ye suffered for the sake
> Of this my quarrel, and the original fault
> Of Paris. Whomsoever fate ordains
> To perish, let him die; but let the rest
> Be from this moment reconciled, and part,
> And bring an offering of two lambs—one white,
> The other black—to Earth and to the Sun,
> And we ourselves will offer one to Jove."

It may be noted, first of all, that throughout Bryant's adherence to the form as well as the substance of the Greek is wonderfully close. "Me whose spirit feels the wrong most keenly" is a good equivalent of Homer's *μάλιστα γὰρ ἄλγος ἱκάνει θυμὸν ἐμόν*, which Derby's rendering is not. The same may be said of the expression, "And the original fault of Paris"—*καὶ 'Αλεξάνδρου ἕνεκ' ἀρχῆς*. Of Lord Derby's use of the terms "Tellus" and "Sol," instead of Earth and Sun, we need only say that it is an absolutely unnecessary resort to the Latin designations of deities, against which, under any circumstances, many strong arguments have been alleged. The employment of the names of the gods of Rome for the essentially

distinct gods of Greece can assuredly be defended only on the ground of long usage and general convenience. We believe that Lord Derby has acted judiciously in adopting, though not without hesitation as he informs us in his preface, the Latin rather than the Greek nomenclature for the heathen deities, and his argument is to our mind conclusive: "I have been induced to do so from the manifest incongruity of confounding the two, and from the fact that though English readers may be familiar with the names of Zeus, or Aphrodite, or even Poseidon, those of Hera, or Ares, or Hephæstus, or Leto would hardly convey to them a definite signification." Upon the same principle of admitting only what is perspicuous, Lord Derby ought to have excluded both "Tellus" and "Sol," especially as these were gods of Rome rather than Greece.

We notice, in passing, that when describing the sacrifice neither Bryant nor Derby mentions the circumstance that the lamb offered to the sun was to be a white *male*, and that offered to the earth a black *ewe* lamb, as is indicated by the gender of the adjective words in the Greek.

Without extending the comparison to other portions of the Iliad, it may be worth while to state the conclusion at which a careful reader of the two translations will, we think, be forced to arrive. As respects fidelity of rendering, both writers appear to have been equally emulous of presenting as perfect an image of Homer as could be conveyed in English verse. Both have striven, as Bryant expresses himself in his preface to the Iliad, "to preserve the simplicity of style which distinguishes the old Greek poet, who wrote for the popular ear and according to the genius of his language." But, of the two, Bryant appears to us to have succeeded in this more signally than Derby, and certainly far better than any other poet whom we are acquainted with. There is a smooth and flowing idiom, the counterpart in our language of the untiring numbers of Homer, which never halt or betray a negligent hand. No attempt is visible in any part to make the translation more ornate than the original. If Homer often condescends in homely language to describe the rude avocations and ruder habits of men, Bryant betrays no false alarm for the honor of his master. When Homer nods, as even Homer, we are told, sometimes does, Bryant is content if his English verses incur no more risk of

being styled monotonous than the Greek hexameters. For better or for worse, he espouses the cause of the bard of Smyrna.

More distinctly noticeable, however, is the superior poetic color of Bryant's translation. If the Earl of Derby occasionally brings his acknowledged excellence as an orator to assist him in the characteristic delineation of the speeches in which the Iliad abounds, Mr. Bryant displays not only the results of a thorough acquaintance with the poetical literature of modern times, but the spirit and fertility of imagination of a *poet.* With him the construction of verses was not an accomplishment laboriously acquired under the enforced discipline of the upper forms in a classical school. "*Poeta nascitur, non fit.*" With uncommon precocity, he began to write poetry, as we all know, before he had fairly emerged from childhood into youth, and the ability to clothe thought in poetical garb was less an attainment than a natural endowment. Add to this that the distinguishing features of Mr. Bryant's own poetry are rather a certain elevation and calm contemplation—that the vicissitudes of human life seem to pass before him as before one seated upon some superior height, where neither its pleasures nor its sorrows affect too much the serenity of his vision—and we seem to have in him the poet who is best calculated to become the interpreter of the great epic poet of Greece; for Homer is not generally an emotional poet, and rarely strives to arouse our sympathies. With him fate is inexorable, human life brief and fitful. Its duration is too short, its pleasures are too transient, its woes too completely merged in the darkness of death and oblivion, to excite a lively joy or a keen regret. Yet the idea of divine retribution runs through his poems and forms a conspicuous feature; and on this point again we need but look at Mr. Bryant's striking poem on Death to see how nearly the current of his habitual representations runs to Homer's view of Nemesis, or the goddess of retribution, and Atè, or the goddess of mischief, of the Greeks.

The mention of the Homeric *Atè* recalls the circumstance that few or none of our English translators have adequately expressed the precise notion of the Greek poet respecting the fearful goddess that plays so important a part in the Iliad, and by whose pernicious influence he explains the otherwise inex-

plicable folly of Agamemnon in affronting the bravest hero among the Greeks. Nowhere is the Homeric conception more distinctly brought out than in that exquisite appeal of the aged Phœnix to the offended Achilles (in the ninth book of the Iliad) to moderate his thirst for vengeance and return to repentant Agamemnon and his followers:

> Καὶ γάρ τε Λιταί εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο,
> χωλαί τε, ῥυσαί τε, παραβλῶπές τ' ὀφϑαλμώ.
> αἵ ῥά τε καὶ μετόπισϑ' Ἄτης ἀλέγουσι κιοῦσαι, κ. τ. λ. (Line 502, etc.,)

which Mr. Bryant thus renders;

> "*Prayers*
> Are the daughters of almighty Jupiter—
> Lame, wrinkled, and squint-eyed—that painfully
> Follow *Misfortune's* steps; but strong of limb
> And swift of foot Misfortune is, and, far
> Outstripping all, comes first to every land,
> And there wreaks evil on mankind, which prayers
> Do afterward redress. Whoe'er receives
> Jove's daughters reverently when they approach,
> Him willingly they aid, and to his suit
> They listen. Whosoever puts them by
> With obstinate denial, they appeal
> To Jove, the son of Saturn, and entreat
> That he will cause *Misfortune* to attend
> The offender's way in life, that he in turn
> May suffer evil, and be punished thus."—(Lines 616–631.)

Now we cheerfully admit the difficulty, or impossibility if you will, of finding any one word in the English language which is the exact counterpart of the Greek Ἄτη; but certainly Mr. Bryant has been exceedingly infelicitous in his selection of *Misfortune* as the nearest equivalent. Viewed as human frailty, the ἄτη of Homer is a blind judicial folly—sin resulting in the loss of the power of discriminating between what is right and profitable and what is wrong and destructive; in short, error, in which the sinfulness of the act is not destroyed by the circumstance that the disposition to commit it is the righteous punishment of the gods for presumption and arrogance, however much the guilty may attempt (as does Agamemnon in the nineteenth book, line 134) to cast the blame upon the immortals. "As a member of the poetical Pantheon," to use the words of Colonel Mure, "Atè is the evil genius, Satan, or tempter, by whom men, or even gods, are

seduced into actions involving future shame and remorse."* In the consistent delineation of the mad course of the elder son of Atreus as the working of this seductive and destructive agency, the author we have just named finds one of his strong arguments for the unity of the Iliad.

In the passage before us Phœnix is urging Achilles to beware of coming under her blight by giving loose rein to his relentless passion:

> "Subdue that mighty spirit of thine;
> Ill it becomes thee to be merciless.
> The gods themselves are placable, though far
> Above us all in honor and in power
> And virtue."

The Até, or judicial blindness with which the deities visit the daring mortal who, self-sufficient, will not suffer the salutary example of the gods to move him, is therefore manifestly different from what we style *Misfortune.* True, as has been said, the translation of the word *Até* is not without its difficulties. To avoid them, as Ogilby and Derby do by leaving it untranslated, is only to make the matter worse, for it makes the passage unintelligible to every one save the classical scholar, who needs no version of the poem at all. Pope misses the meaning altogether when he makes Até to be *Injustice*, as if Injustice were the infliction of the gods in punishment of presumption. Chapman's word, "*Injury*," is better. Voss, generally so happy, only gives a partial, and that the least prominent, view of Até when he names her "Schuld"—*guilt.* Mr. Barter has here more nearly hit the meaning, perhaps, than any one of his competitors:

> "For Prayers the daughters be of Zeus the great;
> Lame, wrinkled they, their eyes askance are set,
> And *Mischief* follow they with care to heal.
> But *Mischief*, vigorous and of footing straight,
> Outruns them all, through earth beforehand still
> Afflicting men. And these behind redress the ill."

In the remaining pages of this article we shall confine ourselves to the consideration of Mr. Bryant's Odyssey. We do this with the more pleasure because the second volume of the translation has been but a short time before the public, and

---

* Critical History of Greek Literature, vol. i, p. 317.

may, therefore, not unnaturally claim attention for its superior novelty. And we are not ashamed to confess that the shorter and perhaps less frequently read of Homer's epics has always possessed in our eyes superior interest to that kindled by its more lengthy rival. Here there is no rapid succession of combats, and there are few descriptions of sanguinary engagements and of the deaths of heroes, so minutely set forth and yet so difficult to be distinguished from one another. In place of this characteristic feature of the Iliad, we have in the Odyssey a narrative of adventure which for variety of incident and sustained movement has few or no rivals in ancient or in modern times. The management of the double plot, itself in strong contrast with the simple plot of the Iliad, requires and evinces even superior artistic skill. No meaner poet than Homer could so boldly have undertaken to weave into a single epic the adventures of Telemachus in search of his father, and of Ulysses through his diversified fortunes until he regained his throne. To carry these parallel stories through about two thirds of the poem, until they merge in one at the meeting of the two heroes, was a perilous attempt, but was accomplished with entire success.

The opening of the Odyssey, an easier one, by the way, to render faithfully in English than that of the Iliad, Mr. Bryant expresses very well:

> "Tell me, O Muse, of that sagacious man
> Who, having overthrown the sacred town
> Of Ilium, wandered far and visited
> The capitals of many nations, learned
> The customs of their dwellers, and endured
> Great suffering on the deep; his life was oft
> In peril, as he labored to bring back
> His comrades to their homes. He saved them not,
> Though earnestly he strove; they perished all,
> Through their own folly; for they banqueted,
> Madmen! upon the oxen of the Sun—
> The all-o'erlooking Sun, who cut them off
> From their return. O goddess, virgin-child
> Of Jove, relate some part of this to me."

The ten lines of the original here expand into fourteen, which perhaps is not an extravagant allowance, considering the shortness of the English line, and the general superiority of the Greek language in the way of brevity of expression. "The

capitals of many nations" may pass as a sufficiently accurate rendering of the *πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων . . . ἄστεα*, since generally every city at that time was a quasi-independent. But the strong turn of expression in line sixth, *ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς*, is too feebly given in the words "He saved them not," and the epithet "*virgin*" in the last line is borne out by nothing in the Greek.

It would be easy to select many passages to prove that Mr. Bryant in his Odyssey does not in the least fall below the high standard of his Iliad, and in fact that, upon the whole, there is even an improvement. To furnish a sample of his exquisite treatment of a purely descriptive passage, we give his translation of that famous account of Calypso's island, when Mercury brought the unwilling nymph Jupiter's command to suffer Ulysses to return to his home:

"But when he reached that island, far away,
Forth from the dark-blue ocean-swell he stepped
Upon the sea-beach, walking till he came
To the vast cave in which the bright-haired nymph
Made her abode. He found the nymph within;
A fire blazed brightly on the hearth, and far
Was wafted o'er the isle the fragrant smoke
Of cloven cedar, burning in the flame,
And cypress-wood. Meanwhile, in her recess,
She sweetly sang, as busily she threw
The golden shuttle through the web she wove.
And all about the grotto alders grew,
And poplars, and sweet-smelling cypresses.
In a green forest, high among whose boughs
Birds of broad wing, wood-owls, and falcons built
Their nests, and crows, with voices sounding far,
All haunting for their food the ocean-side,
A vine, with downy leaves and clustering grapes,
Crept over all the cavern-rock. Four springs
Poured forth their glittering waters in a row,
And here and there went wandering side by side.
Around were meadows of soft green, o'ergrown
With violets and parsley. 'Twas a spot
Where even an immortal might awhile
Linger and gaze with wonder and delight.
The herald Argus-queller stood, and saw,
And marveled." (Bryant, Odyss. V, 69, etc.)

The description of Mercury's flight from Olympus to Calypso's isle, which immediately precedes the passage we have just

quoted, occurs also in the Iliad, (Book XXIV, 339–345,) where it depicts his flight from the same mountain to carry Jove's mandate to Priam. In each case we have no less than seven consecutive lines which are the same, word for word. Were not such repetitions frequent and closely woven in the very texture of the poems, they might be regarded as interpolations; as it is, they constitute, to our apprehension, a very conclusive proof of the common authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey. The coincidences between the two poems are, however, a less striking peculiarity than the repetitions in different parts of one and the same poem. Socrates was once reproached by an impatient antagonist with continually talking of the same subjects and employing the same trite illustrations; to which he had a very apt reply in readiness: that, while others were forever making contradictory statements about the same things, he at least said the same about the same. In a somewhat different sense this is strikingly true of the great bard of Smyrna. Having once satisfied himself in the selection of an appropriate form of words for the expression of a particular thought, he seems loth to abandon it, and certainly never avoids the repetition through fear lest his hearer or reader may be less pleased with it than if another expression were substituted.* The repetitions extend to long passages in close proximity to each other. When in the ninth book of the Iliad the envoys of Agamemnon enumerate the splendid gifts which the king stands ready to present to Achilles if he will but be reconciled and return to the camp, they employ through thirty-

---

* We do not, of course, mean to affirm that the poet allows himself no freedom in this matter. Occasionally he strikes out in an entirely different track, or combines what he has said before with something new. Thus the famous couplet of the Iliad (Book IX, 312 and 313):

'Εχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς 'Αΐδαο πύλησιν,
ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴτη—
"Him as the gate of hell my soul abhors,
Whose outward speech his secret thought belies," (Derby)—

reappears with the second line modified in the Odyssey (Book XIV, 156–7):

'Εχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς 'Αΐδαο πύλησιν
γίγνεται, ὅς πενίη εἴκων ἀπατήλια βάζει—
"For as the gates of hell do I detest
The man who, tempted by his poverty,
Deceives with lying words."
(Bryant, Odyssey XIV, 187-190.)

six consecutive lines the very words used by Agamemnon in his instructions to them less than a hundred and fifty lines earlier in the same canto. They merely change the person of the verb and pronoun where it becomes necessary. (Lines 122–157 and 263–299.)

Now this will hardly be asserted by any one to arise from any reluctance of Homer to try the resources of his wonderful creative power. The profusion of illustrative imagery, often employed to what we would consider an unnecessary extent, forbids the supposition. We ought rather to regard the commonplaces of Homer as having their origin in the peculiar circumstances of the composition and recitation of his poems, which were intended for the diversion of the people at the public festivals and on the days consecrated to the worship of the gods. A familiar and frequently-recurring line as the preface to a speech, or several lines describing the well-known rites of the sacrifice or the incidents of the meal, afforded a slight rest alike to the rhapsodist and to his listeners. The former could collect his thoughts for the ensuing passage, the latter could relax their close attention. Besides, these more unstudied verses served an excellent purpose in setting off those loftier sentiments of which they were the frame.

So singular a feature in the original ought, we think, to have obtained more recognition from his translators. If Homer is to be presented faithfully to English readers, he should be allowed to repeat himself in the translation wherever he repeats himself in the Greek. Mr. Bryant has not thought this a necessity, preferring to give to his work a variety which does not exist in the original. For instance, the swine-herd Eumæus, inquiring who Ulysses is and whence he comes, uses the same playful language that Telemachus addresses to Minerva when, in the form of Mentes, she presented herself to him in the palace (Odyssey I, 170–3):

> *Τίς, πόθεν εἷς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*
> *ὁπποίης δ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἀφίκεο; πῶς δέ σε ναῦται, κ. τ. λ.*

In the first book Mr. Bryant translates with the context as follows:

> "But now, I pray,
> Tell me, and frankly tell me, *who thou art,*
> *And of what race of men, and where thy home,*

> *And who thy parents; how the mariners*
> *Brought thee to Ithaca, and who they claim*
> *To be, for well I deem thou couldst not come*
> *Hither on foot.*" (Lines 208–214.)

In the fourteenth book the same words read thus:

> "And now, old man,
> Relate, I pray, thy fortunes. Tell me true,
> That I may know *who thou mayst be, and whence*
> *Thou camest; where thy city lies, and who*
> *Thy parents were; what galley landed thee*
> *Upon our coast, and how the mariners*
> *Brought thee to Ithaca, and of what race*
> *They claim to be; for I may well suppose*
> *Thou hadst not come to Ithaca on foot.*" (Lines 231–9.)

The only advantage of the second over the first translation is that it inserts a rendering for *ὁπποίης δ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἀφίκεο*, which the other omits entirely.

Another illustration of the same thing may be found in the same books. In the first, Telemachus bewails the unfortunate disappearance of his father:

> "I should not grieve
> So deeply for his loss if he had fallen
> With his companions on the field of Troy,
> *Or midst his kindred when the war was o'er.*
> *Then all the Greeks had built his monument,*
> *And he had left his son a heritage*
> *Of glory. Now has he become the prey*
> *Of Harpies, perishing ingloriously,*
> Unseen, his fate unheard of, and has left
> Mourning and grief, my portion." (Lines 293–302.)

And in the fourteenth book we have the same lament, but this time placed in the mouth of Eumæus:

> "The gods all hate
> My master, since they neither caused his death
> In the great war of Troy, *nor, when the war*
> *Was over, suffered him to die at home,*
> *And in the arms of those who loved him most;*
> *For then would all the Greeks have reared to him*
> *A monument, and mighty would have been*
> *The heritage of glory for his son;*
> *But now ingloriously the harpy brood*
> *Have torn him.*" (Lines 446–455.)

As in the last instance, the words in italics are those which translate the same Greek verses. We think that it will be

clear to every scholar that Mr. Bryant would have done well to have repeated himself. Certainly he has not bettered the rendering. "Or midst his kindred when the war was o'er" is more faithful than the two lines and more which express the same sentiment in the other version. This and other expansions have swollen the translation of the *four* lines of the original from *five* in Mr. Bryant's first book to about *seven* in his fourteenth. It is needless to remark that "the harpy brood" is far less definite, exact, and poetical than the simple designation of the "Harpies."

The story which Eumæus told of his adventures from the time when he was kidnapped by Phœnician sailors from his princely home, to be sold into slavery in another part of the Greek world, is interesting as throwing light upon the manners and customs of the day. It was a Sidonian woman, herself torn from a wealthy home by *Greek* pirates, that served as the instrument of betraying him into the hands of her countrymen. Mr. Bryant thus renders the narrative:

> "There came a crew of that seafaring race,
> The people of Phœnicia, to our isle.
> Shrewd fellows they, and brought in their black ship
> Large store of trinkets. In my father's house
> Was a Phœnician woman, large and fair,
> And skilled in embroidery. As she came
> A laundress to their ship, those cunning men
> Seduced her. One of them obtained her love;
> For oft doth love mislead weak womankind,
> Even of the more discreet. . . .
> The Phœnician crew remained
> Until the twelvemonth's end, and filled their ship
> With many things, and when its roomy hull
> Was fully laden, sent a messenger
> To tell the woman. He, a cunning man,
> Came to my father's house, and brought with him
> A golden necklace set with amber beads.
> The palace maidens and the gracious queen,
> My mother, took it in their hands, and gazed
> Upon it, and debated of its price.
> Meantime the bearer gave the sign, and soon
> Departed to the ship. The woman took
> My hand and led me forth. Within the hall
> She found upon the tables ready placed
> The goblets for my father's guests, his peers;
> But they were absent, and in council yet
> Amid a great assembly. She concealed

> Three goblets in her bosom, and bore off
> The theft. I followed thoughtlessly. The sun
> Went down, and darkness brooded o'er the ways.
> Briskly we walked, and reached the famous port
> And the fast-sailing ship. They took us both
> On board, and sailed." (Book XV, lines 526, etc.)

In this fine bit of word-painting there is little to criticise. A minor inaccuracy occurs in lines 531 and 532. The Phœnician woman does not appear in the Greek as having come "a laundress to their ship;" but her countrymen merely met her as she washed, doubtless for the princely family to which she was a slave, at some spring or stream that flowed into the sea near the spot where the ship was drawn up upon the sands. The poet, it will be remembered, represents (Odyssey VI, 109, etc.) even a queen's daughter, Nausicaa, as engaged with her maidens, after the same primitive fashion, in washing not far from the sea on

> "The river's pleasant brink,
> Where lavers had been hollowed out to last
> Perpetually, and freely through them flowed
> Pure water that might cleanse the foulest stains."

In the line before us Homer simply says:

> *πλυνούσῃ τις πρῶτα μίγη, κοίλῃ παρὰ νηῒ.*

We have looked for some of our favorite passages, and we have in no case failed to find a noble and worthy rendering in Bryant's Odyssey. Take the sixteenth book, in which Telemachus recounts to his now recovered father the numbers of the haughty suitors for Penelope with whom Ulysses will have to contend before he regains his throne, with a feeling akin to that which prompts Elisha's servant, seeing the city encompassed with horses and chariots, to exclaim: "Alas, my master! how shall we do?" (2 Kings vi, 15.) There is some touch of the Hebrew prophet's heroism in the reply of Ulysses, although it comes far short of the simple assurance, "Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them." The Supreme God, the god of justice, and his daughter, the goddess of reason, Ulysses says, are on his side:

> "'Now, if thy thought
> Be turned to some ally, bethink thee who
> Will combat for us with a willing heart.'

> Again Ulysses, the great sufferer, spake:
> 'Then will I tell thee; listen, and give heed.
> Think whether Pallas and her father, Jove,
> Suffice not for us. Need we more allies?'
> And then discreet Telemachus rejoined:
> 'Assuredly the twain whom thou hast named
> Are mighty as allies; for though they sit
> On high among the clouds, they yet bear rule
> Both o'er mankind and o'er the living gods.'"

We have room but for one more extract from this delightful poem, of whose excellences no line or lines taken here and there can give an adequate idea, but which to be fully appreciated must be read from beginning to end. We quote the exquisite description of the embrace of Ulysses and Penelope, when at last the latter has been convinced that she sees before her her long absent lord:

> "She spake, and he was moved to tears; he wept
> As in his arms he held his dearly loved
> And faithful wife. As welcome as the land
> To those who swim the deep, of whose stout bark
> Neptune has made a wreck amid the waves,
> Tossed by the billow and the blast, and few
> Are those who from the hoary ocean reach
> The shore, their limbs all crested with the brine,
> These gladly climb the sea-beach, and are safe,—
> So welcome was her husband to her eyes.
> Nor would her fair white arms release his neck,
> And there would rosy-fingered Morn have found
> Both weeping, but the blue-eyed Pallas planned
> That thus it should not be; she stayed the night
> When near its close, and held the golden Morn
> Long in the ocean deeps, nor suffered her
> To yoke her steeds that bring the light to men,—
> Lampas and Phaëthon, swift steeds that bear
> The Morning on her way." (Book XXIII, lines 280-298.)

In conclusion, we need only to express our conviction that Mr. Bryant has given us a translation of both of Homer's great epics which is unequaled in our language for its fidelity both to the spirit and to the letter of the original—a work, in short, which, while it reflects great credit upon his classical scholarship, will invest with still higher glory his well-earned poetical laurels.

Art. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly, July, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Certainty in Religion. 2. Palfrey on Religious Intolerance in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. 3. Jewish Proselyte Baptism. 4. The Platonic Myths. 5. The Warning against Apostasy.

Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1872. (Andover.)—1. The Influence of the Press. 2. Destructive Analysis in Theology. 3. Revelation and Inspiration. 4. Characteristics of the Growth of Christ's Kingdom. 5. Lyell's Student's Elements of Geology. 6. Christ as a Practical Observer of Nature, Persons, and Events. 7. Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι.—John i, 26. 8. Church Creeds. 9. Hebrew Grammar and Lexicography. 10. Dr. Hodge's Systematic Theology.

Christian Quarterly, July, 1872. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Doctrine of the Atonement. 2. The Status and Relations of the Christian Church. 3. Judaic Baptism. 4. The Representative Import of "Ekklesia." 5. Have Human Speculations Obscured the Once Plain Way? 6. The Office of the Presbytery. 7. The Worshiping of Jesus. 8. Peter and Paul on Baptism and Justification.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, July, 1872. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Principle of the Lutheran Reformation. 2. The Descent of Man. 3. The Communion of Saints. 4. John Kepler, the German Astronomer. 5. Sources of Power in Preaching. 6. The Eloquence of St. Paul. 7. Recent Works on English Literature. 8. Exposition of 1 Cor. xv, 22.

Theological Medium, A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, July, 1872. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Sum Via. ("I am the Way.") 2. Man's Creation and Capabilities. 3. Creation ex Nihilo. 4. An Apology for Faith. 5. Christianity a Universal Religion. 6. The Evangelical Union of Scotland. 7. The Passover. 8. The Jesuits. 9. Philosophic and Religious Basis for a Life of Jesus Christ; Supernaturalism.

Universalist Quarterly, July, 1872. (Boston.)—1. The Genesis of Science. 2. Letters of Murray and Richards. 3. Reminiscences of W. J. Fox, of London, and of the Author of "Nearer, my God, to Thee." 4. Doctrinal Phases of Universalism during the Past Century. 5. Africa: Physical, Historical, and Ethnological.—Christian Missions. 6. Bayle and Leclerc; or, The Manichean and the Universalist.

The fourth article, by Rev. G. W. Whitney, is a review of Mr. Dorchester's discussion of Universalist History in our Quarterly. It is free-spoken, but courteous and candid.

In regard to the spiritual decline imputed to Universalism by Mr. Dorchester, the Reviewer replies: "In point of fact it is continually tending toward a higher religious experience. We feel confident that the last twenty years have witnessed a great improvement in the devotional aspects of Universalism, though aware that much remains to be done. This incompleteness is not owing to inherent defects, we apprehend, but to the magnitude of the work and human imperfection. When has man ever done his work perfectly?"—P. 323.

He quotes the decline which occurred even in Luther's days

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, *July*, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Certainty in Religion. 2. Palfrey on Religious Intolerance in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. 3. Jewish Proselyte Baptism. 4. The Parsaic Myths. 5. The Warning against Apostasy.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, *July*, 1872. (Andover.)—1. The Influence of the Press. 2. Destructive Analysis in Theology. 3. Revelation and Inspiration. 4. Characteristics of the Growth of Christ's Kingdom. 5. Lyell's Student's Elements of Geology. 6. Christ as a Practical Observer of Nature, Persons, and Events. 7. Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι—John i, 26. 8. Church Creeds. 9. Hebrew Grammar and Lexicography. 10. Dr. Hodge's Systematic Theology.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, *July*, 1872. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Doctrine of the Atonement. 2. The Status and Relations of the Christian Church. 3. Judaic Baptism. 4. The Representative Import of "Ecclesia." 5. Have Human Speculations Obscured the Once Plain Way? 6. The Office of the Presbytery. 7. The Worshiping of Jesus. 8. Peter and Paul on Baptism and Justification.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, *July*, 1872. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Principle of the Lutheran Reformation. 2. The Descent of Man. 3. The Communion of Saints. 4. John Kepler, the German Astronomer. 5. Sources of Power in Preaching. 6. The Eloquence of St. Paul. 7. Recent Works on English Literature. 8. Exposition of 1 Cor. xv, 22.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, *July*, 1872. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Ego Via. ("I am the Way.") 2. Man's Creation and Capabilities. 3. Creation ex Nihilo. 4. An Apology for Faith. 5. Christianity a Universal Religion. 6. The Evangelical Union of Scotland. 7. The Passover. 8. The Jesuits. 9. Philosophic and Religious Basis for a Life of Jesus Christ; Supernaturalism.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, *July*, 1872. (Boston.)—1. The Genesis of Science. 2. Letters of Murray and Richards. 3. Reminiscences of W. J. Fox, of London, and of the Author of "Nearer, my God, to Thee." 4. Doctrinal Phases of Universalism during the Past Century. 5. Africa: Physical, Historical, and Ethnological.—Christian Missions. 6. Bayle and Leibnitz; or, The Manichaeans and the Universalists.

THE fourth article, by Rev. G. W. Whitney, is a review of Mr. Dorchester's discussion of Universalist History in our Quarterly. It is free-spoken, but courteous and candid.

In regard to the spiritual decline imputed to Universalism by Mr. Dorchester, the Reviewer replies: "In point of fact it is continually tending toward a higher religious experience. We feel confident that the last twenty years have witnessed a great improvement in the devotional aspects of Universalism, though aware that much remains to be done. This incompleteness is not owing to inherent defects, we apprehend, but to the magnitude of the work and human imperfection. When has man ever done his work perfectly?"—P. 328.

He quotes the decline which occurred even in Luther's days in the fervor of the piety of the reformed Churches, and the generally inferior fervor of Protestantism in comparison with Catholicism. He then adds the following paragraphs, containing thoughts which it may be well for Methodists to hear and to weigh:

"The Methodist Church, which seems to be a solitary exception, is unique because it represents a tendency to return to the primitive fervor of the Church, and rests its claims more largely on its warmth and zeal than on any doctrines which distinguish it. Yet even the followers of Wesley have not equaled, we believe, the fervor and the constancy of the early Church. That was strong enough to force its way among a people utterly hostile to its spread, and relied so much on its power over the hearts of believers that every diversity of belief was allowed except on the fundamental point of Christ's authority. Limitarians, Annihilationists, Universalists, all labored together, and the good work prospered in their hands. Thus the Church existed for more than two hundred years, and very rarely did it lose its hold on any of its members. Indeed, the Methodist Church can scarcely be said to equal the Catholic Church in fervor and religious power; and if it exhibits some results which the Romanists cannot equal, is it not fair to attribute them to its better doctrines, rather than to its superior methods? We cannot help admiring many of the æsthetic accessories of the 'Mother Church,' nor refrain from contrasting them with the meager details of Methodist routine. The Catholic Church is like a plant with many roots, and could get along better without the doctrine of endless misery than could the Methodist. The next fifty years will test the *spiritual* power of Methodism as it never has been tested before."—P. 324.

Our Reviewer quotes two passages, both second-hand, to show that Wesley was a Universalist! It is by wrenching them from their connections and imposing upon their mere verbiage a meaning that never entered Wesley's head. In their true meaning our Methodism of the present hour perfectly coincides in letter and spirit with every word and syllable. The first quotation, with the Reviewer's own italics, is as follows:

"*By salvation I mean not barely, according to the vulgar notion, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven, but a present*

deliverance from sin. Now, if by salvation we mean a present salvation from sin, we cannot say holiness is the condition of it, for it is the thing itself."—P. 333.

Premising that the word "vulgar" here is used in the sense, more prevalent then than now, as synonymous with *common* or *ordinary*, the words no more deny a future "hell" than a future "heaven." Methodism at the present hour places the same emphasis on "a present salvation" that Wesley did. This present deliverance from sin, however, though predominantly pressed as an immediate need, is ever held, both by Wesley and us, as including the more distant deliverance from hell. The hell of a future world is truly *sin gone to seed;* the essence of a future heaven is the perfect blessedness of perfected holiness. Hence, while hell and heaven are in the distant prospect, present deliverance from sin and present perfected holiness fill our present thoughts as the very essence of our "present salvation." It is by clinging to this beautiful Wesleyan view of a "present salvation" that our Methodism at this hour still glows with the fervor of her early years. Not one hairs-breadth have we swerved—we fervently pray that not one hairs-breadth we may ever swerve—from Wesley on this point. Our spirituality will then weather through "the next fifty years," of which the Reviewer kindly forewarns us. The last extract, with the Reviewer's italics, is in the following words:

"Have we not farther ground for thankfulness, yea, and strong consolation, in the blessed hope which is given us, that the time is at hand when righteousness shall be as universal as unrighteousness is now? Allowing that the whole creation now groaneth together under the man of sin; our comfort is, *it will not always groan.* God will arise and maintain his own cause; and *the whole creation shall be delivered both from moral and natural corruption.* Sin and its consequence, pain, *shall be no more!* holiness and happiness will cover the earth. Then shall all the ends of the world see the salvation of our God. *And the whole race of mankind shall know, and love, and serve God, and reign with him for ever and ever.*"—P. 333.

In our boyhood, (if we may quote some personal reminiscences,) while in academic preparation for college, we read a number

of Universalist books by Balfour, Ballou, and others. In our course of reading was a history of Universalism, of which the author's name, we think, was Brown, who had once been a Methodist preacher. In his book, we seem to remember, this very extract was given, for the same purpose, of showing Wesley a Universalist. From all this we infer that this passage is a hereditary and permanent staple with our Universalist friends. Our farther dim reminiscence is, that we turned to Wesley's Sermons, found the passage, and, assuming that the making the quotation originated with Brown, we drew the conclusion that Brown was not a reliable quoter. We have not since reversed that conclusion. We are even obliged to feel that our Reviewer, who has inherited the delusive quotation, must also inherit his share of reputation for unreliability. We frankly suggest to the able editor of the "Universalist Quarterly," Dr. Thayer, that Universalism has at the present time scholarly and critical men enough, who must be sensible of the wrong done to themselves by an established set of deceptive or palpably misconstrued quotations, and who ought to revise their stock of this kind of capital. And we also suggest to the Reviewer that it belongs to a conscientious citer of passages *first*, to quote, when practicable, from the original author; *second*, to state where in that author the passage may be found; and *third*, above all things, to beware of overlaying the quoted words with a meaning unintended by their author. A due observance of these rules would—not have made him adduce these passages more correctly, but—have entirely prevented his adducing any one of them at all.

Mr. Wesley would very plainly affirm a salvation of a "whole race of mankind;" but it is of a "whole race of mankind" at one particular period living on earth. This is far from including, in the absolute, the entire race through all ages descended from Adam. Nothing is more natural than for the census-man to say that the whole race of mankind numbers so many millions; meaning *the race now living*. There are philosophers who believe that, by a law of progress, "the race" is tending to perfection, until finally "the whole race of mankind" will walk the earth perfected beings; that is, the race then living.

The passage quoted is to be found at the close of the sixty-

sixth, in Mr. Wesley's edition of his collected sermons. Let it be remembered that these sermons were by him collected, carefully revised and published, as embodying the divinity bequeathed by him to the world, and especially to Methodism. They have been accepted, so far as their proper theological doctrines are concerned, in England and America as standards. Neither the Methodists of America, nor the Wesleyans of England, have ever read any thing like Universalism, or any other *ism* they do not indorse, into this paragraph. Neither the contemporaries of Mr. Wesley, nor his personal friends, ever suspected that either in these words, or any other words, he avowed the least momentary belief in Universalism. Of all the lives published, not one has furnished any sentence, any momentary anecdotal remark, of his indicating a leaning to the actual salvation of all mankind. Very incredible, then, that such should be the true meaning of these words, written and deliberately published by Wesley, and staring all Methodism in the face from that day to this!

A little later, in this same volume, is a terrible sermon on Hell, describing its fearful conditions, and asserting its absolute perpetuity of suffering. Between the two, in the volume, is a sermon on The Universal Spread of the Gospel. We shall make parallel extracts from these three sermons, including the passage quoted, to enable the reader to judge whether that passage affirms the salvation of any more than the race in the latter day on the earth.

From Sermon on "General Spread of the Gospel."—Ser. 68.	"*On the Mystery of Iniquity.*"—Ser. 66.	"*On Hell.*"—Ser. 78.
"It will not be always thus. . . . God . . . will never intermit . . . . until he hath put a period to sin, and misery, and infirmity; and death, and re-established universal holiness and happiness, and caused all the inhabitants of the earth to sing together, Hallelujah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"	"It will not always groan; . . . the whole creation shall then be delivered both from moral and natural corruption. Sin, and its consequence, pain, shall be no more: holiness and happiness will cover the earth. Then shall all the ends of the world see the salvation of our God, and the whole race of mankind shall know, and love, and serve God, and reign with him for ever and ever."—[The extract quoted in the *Universalist Quarterly*.]	"The inhabitants of hell have nothing to divert them from their torments, even for a moment. . . . Every instant of their duration they are tremblingly alive. . . . And of this duration there is no end! . . . Such is the account which the Judge of all the earth gives of the punishment which he has ordained for impenitent sinners."

The first two of these extracts are plainly parallel in meaning. The one finishes up, positively, the glorious results on earth of the triumphant spread of the Gospel; the second, negatively, paints the results on earth of the overthrow of iniquity. But these results do not spread beyond the earth, and terminate or mitigate the torments of hell, as they are described in the third extract; for of their "duration there is no end." But, in the second extract, "the whole race of mankind" is expressly limited, as being the "whole" within a given area; namely, not hell, but "the earth," "the ends of the world," "the whole creation." We submit that our Universalist friends have no right to quote this passage in proof of Wesley's belief of the salvation of all the descendants of Adam from sin or "hell."

It is in his attempt to show, by way of retort, that *Methodism has varied from her founder, Wesley*, that our Reviewer, from making second-hand and falsifying quotations, commits a most disastrous failure. To show how we *have departed from Wesley in ecclesiastical policy* he adduces two paragraphs from a hostile author, Rev. George H. Randall, in the Pitts-street Chapel Lectures; paragraphs which contain not only truth so stated as to convey falsehood, but actual falsehood, and even forgery, of important and hinging words, surreptitiously imputed to Wesley. Our Reviewer, upon reviewing himself, must see that his procedure in quoting is rather questionable. There exist many lives of Wesley and histories of our founding by standard authors—Southey, Richard Watson, Henry Moore, Dr. Stevens, and, within the last year, republished by the Harpers, the elaborate Life of Wesley, by Tyerman—all going over this subject. What excuse, then, has our Reviewer for ignoring all these authentic and original authorities and taking up, second-hand, the one-sided statements of a hostile polemic? By so doing he has made himself partaker of another man's sins—sins, as we shall show, of a tolerably deep turpitude. We give Mr. Randall's two paragraphs as they stand quoted in the *Universalist Quarterly:*

"At a meeting of their preachers in 1744 he says, 'I exhorted them to keep to the Church, observing that this was our peculiar glory—not to form any new sect, but, abiding in our own Church, to do to all men all the good we possibly could.' On

another occasion, a strong sectarian spirit having shown itself, Mr. Wesley persuaded his followers to resolve, without a dissenting voice, that 'It is by no means expedient that the Methodists should leave the Church of England.' So strongly did this feeling show itself, that the declaration was inserted in the first rules of their society: 'They that leave the Church leave us.' 'And this we did,' says Mr. Wesley, 'not as a point of prudence, but a point of conscience.' In 1789, two years before his death, he said, 'I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it.' In a sermon preached about this time in Cork 'he declared to the preachers in his Connection that they had no right to baptize and administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.'

"Again, Mr. Wesley, when he was eighty years of age, in a private chamber of a public-house in Bristol, England, was induced to lay his hands upon the head of Rev. Dr. Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, appointing him as a *superintendent* over the missionary operations of the Methodists in America. On Dr. Coke's arrival in this country he proceeded to lay his hands on the head of a Mr. Asbury, a layman, and thereby ordained him to the same office of superintendent. These two men soon began to call themselves bishops. When Mr. Wesley heard of this, he immediately rebuked their arrogation of an office and title which he never pretended to have conveyed. In a letter to Mr. Asbury he says: '*How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be elected a bishop?* I shudder, I start, at the very thought. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put an end to this.'"

The first of these two paragraphs furnishes the proofs that Wesley to the last insisted that the *English* Methodists should not leave the Church, that his *unordained English* preachers had no right to baptize or administer the sacraments, and that Wesley died a professed member of the Church of England. All this is verbally true. But it is so shaped, and purposely shaped, as to make the uninformed reader think (as it has our Reviewer) that on these points *American* Methodism had deserted Wesley. Now what has our Reviewer to say to the true history of the Church? In consequence of our becoming an independent nation Wesley gave us our present

polity of an *independent* Church with ordained Bishops—independent of the English Church; independent of the Americo-Anglican Church. We have retained precisely the very unchanged polity Wesley gave us. Our eight bishops elected and ordained last May are the true successional descendants by ordination, by the ritual laying on of hands, from Wesley through Coke. So far from deserting Wesley herein, we, the American Methodist Episcopal Church, have obeyed him to the letter.

The second paragraph is still worse. It contains a forgery of a word or two, falsely imputed to Wesley, vital to the discussion, as the following comparison will show:

WESLEY'S REAL WORDS.	MR. RANDALL'S SUBSTITUTE.
"How can you, how dare you; suffer yourself to be *called* bishop? I shudder, I start, at the very thought? Men may *call* me a knave or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never, by my consent, *call* me a bishop. For my sake, for God's sake, put an end to this."—*Tyerman's Wesley*, vol. iii, p. 438. [The italics are our own.]	"*How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be elected a bishop?* I shudder, I start, at the very thought. For my sake, for God's sake, put an end to this." [The italics are Mr. Randall's, or the Reviewer's.]

Mr. Randall's forgery consists in surreptitiously substituting the word "elected" for Wesley's word "called," and striking out a requisite sentence. And this one substituted word makes all the difference in the issue. Mr. Wesley never objected to Asbury's being "*elected*" or ordained bishop. He himself ordained Coke bishop, with the intention that Coke should ordain Asbury bishop. What he objected to was the being "called" so. And hence, Wesley uses the verb *call* three times. And Mr. Randall, in order to be as economical of forgery as possible, strikes out the next entire sentence in order to avoid this word—a fact which indicates his conscious dishonesty. The omitted sentence would, if inserted in line with Mr. Randall's forgery, make Wesley say that he would rather *be* a scoundrel than a bishop! Wesley, at first, intended that our American bishops should be called by the Latin word *superintendent*, a synonym of the Greek word *bishop*, just as *elder* is synonymous with *presbyter*. He preferred the Latin word because the Greek term, being worn

by the English bishops, had an air of pomp exceedingly annoying to him in England. As that feeling did not exist in America, where no pompous hierarchy wore the name, our people preferring the Episcopal form of polity sent over by Wesley, preferred also the Episcopal word. They called themselves the "Methodist Episcopal Church," with Wesley's subsequent approbation. They placed his name, with at least his silent concurrence, on the printed Minutes as "exercising the Episcopal office." It may be added that Wesley in the same letter reprehended the application of the name "college" to Cokesbury College, established in Virginia by the American Methodists, clearly evincing that he disapproved not the *thing* but the *name.*

All this ground has been gone over by our writers so many times and so fully, and even during the past year, in our Quarterly, and is so well understood by our people, that it is unnecessary for us to prosecute the subject farther. Every now and then, however, a green outsider turns up with this "mare's nest," fresh and new. But seldom have we encountered a writer who undertakes to treat the subject with such a minimum of knowledge as Mr. Whitney; and the first instance of outright forgery is detected in Mr. Randall. If the Reviewer wishes to *know* a little something about the subject he so unwisely discusses, let him read Dr. Stevens's Appendix to the third volume of Tyerman's Wesley, published by the Harpers.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, July, 1872. (St. Louis.)—1. Apostolical Succession. 2. Southern Voices. 3. A Survey of the Churches. 4. Hume's Philosophy. 5. Hon. A. H. Stephens, D.D., on the Late War. 6. Romance of Real Life. 7. London and its People. 8. D. D. Whedon, D.D.

Dr. Bledsoe has now devoted nearly sixty pages of two numbers of his Quarterly to "D. D. Whedon, D.D.," in which he has prostituted the office of honorable criticism to the gratification of personal spite. As his former article contained three tangible moral charges of literary theft against the individual named, we employed ten pages in self-defense, rolling back upon this personal calumniator the demonstrations of his own mendacity. Our work was completely and conclusively done. A glance at his article in the present number reveals the fact that Dr. Bledsoe neither has said, nor can say, any thing in that strain that demands a farther answer.

English Reviews.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. William of Occam. 2. Wit and Humor. 3. Report of the Commissioners on Coal. 4. Marco Polo's Travels. 5. An Ecclesiastical Tournament in Edinburgh. 6. The Agricultural Laborers' Strike. 7. Germany: Prussian Influence on its Literature. 8. Results of Disestablishment in Ireland.

LONDON QUARTERLY, July, 1872. (London.)—1. The Post-Office. 2. Logic and Logical Studies in England. 3. The Old and the New Catholics. 4. John Wesley in Mature and Later Life. 5. The German Protestant League. 6. The Life of Thomas Cooper.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprinted by the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Pilgrimages to the Shrines of England. 2. The Reign of Terror, and its Secret Police. 3. Mr. John Stuart Mill and his School. 4. Italian Painting. 5. The Revision of the English Bible. 6. The Stuarts. 7. England and France: their Customs, Manners, and Morality. 8. Competitive Examination and the Civil Service. 9. Priests, Parliaments, and Electors.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprinted by the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Sovereignty: Royal and Representative. 2. English Philology. 3. Greek Lyrical Poetry. 4. Dr. Newman: The Difficulties of Protestantism. 5. The Politics of Aristotle. 6. André Chénier: Poet and Political Martyr. 7. Recent Experiments with the Senses.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Complete Works of Bishop Berkeley. 2. The Stuarts of St. Germains. 3. Helps' Thoughts upon Government. 4. The Popes and the Italian Humanists. 5. The Southern States since the War. 6. Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal. 7. Researches on Life and Disease. 8. Reform in Japan. 9. The Bennett Judgment.

The article on the "Southern States since the War" conveys to us a clearer view of the whole field than we have derived from any other source. It is mainly based upon a volume by a Mr. Somers, of which the following account is given: "The great resources of these Southern States are scarcely understood even in the Northern States, and are almost unknown to the rest of the world. Their peculiar domestic institution made the Southern people jealous of the observing eyes of foreigners, and induced them to cultivate an almost Chinese isolation. Since the war they have been jealous of the influence of Northern immigrants upon the negroes, and have not encouraged intercourse. Mr. Robert Somers, as an Englishman and a man of business, found none of this jealousy. He set out from Washington in the autumn of 1870, and traveled over the whole South, every-where noting the commercial and industrial condition and resources of the country, and gathering an immense mass of the most valuable information. His volume, though without literary arrangement or finish—

English Reviews.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. William of Occam. 2. Wit and Humor. 3. Report of the Commissioners on Coal. 4. Marco Polo's Travels. 5. An Ecclesiastical Tournament in Edinburgh. 6. The Agricultural Labourers' Strike. 7. Germany: Prussian Influence on its Literature. 8. Results of Disestablishment in Ireland.

LONDON QUARTERLY, July, 1872. (London.)—1. The Post-Office. 2. Logic and Logical Studies in England. 3. The Old and the New Catholics. 4. John Wesley in Mature and Later Life. 5. The German Protestant League. 6. The Life of Thomas Cooper.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprinted by the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Pilgrimages to the Shrines of England. 2. The Reign of Terror, and its Secret Police. 3. Mr. John Stuart Mill and his School. 4. Italian Painting. 5. The Revision of the English Bible. 6. The Senate. 7. England and France: their Customs, Manners, and Morality. 8. Competitive Examination and the Civil Service. 9. Private Parliaments and Electors.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprinted by the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Sovereignty: Royal and Representative. 2. English Philology. 3. Greek Lyrical Poetry. 4. Dr. Newman: The Difficulties of Protestantism. 5. The Politics of Aristotle. 6. Asiatic Cholera: Past and Political History. 7. Recent Experiments with the Senses.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Complete Works of Bishop Berkeley. 2. The Stuarts of St. Germains. 3. Helps' Thoughts upon Government. 4. The Papacy and the Italian Humanists. 5. The Southern States since the War. 6. Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal. 7. Researches on Life and Disease. 8. Reform in Japan. 9. The Bennett Judgment.

The article on the "Southern States since the War" conveys to us a clearer view of the whole field than we have derived from any other source. It is mainly based upon a volume by a Mr. Somers, of which the following account is given: "The great resources of these Southern States are scarcely understood even in the Northern States, and are almost unknown to the rest of the world. Their peculiar domestic institution made the Southern people jealous of the observing eyes of foreigners, and induced them to cultivate an almost Chinese isolation. Since the war they have been jealous of the influence of Northern immigrants upon the negroes, and have not encouraged intercourse. Mr. Robert Somers, as an Englishman and a man of business, found none of this jealousy. He set out from Washington in the autumn of 1870, and traveled over the whole South, every-where noting the commercial and industrial condition and resources of the country, and gathering an immense mass of the most valuable information. His volume, though without literary arrangement or finish—

rudis indigestaque moles as to its form, and as to its abundant matter

. . . . Congestaque eoden
Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum—

is the most complete account yet given to the public of the condition and prospects of the Southern States since the war."—P. 79.

RUIN OF THE SOUTH BY THE WAR.

After describing the iron system of the slaveholding oligarchy before the war, the Reviewer describes thus the results of the war: "The failure of the Confederation shattered this whole social structure as none was ever shattered before. It not only freed the slaves, but it enslaved the masters. It not only ruined the political position of the planters, but destroyed their commercial prosperity. During those years of supreme effort and agony, when the country was first isolated from the outer world and then ravaged by the incursions of a victorious enemy, the labor system became disorganized, the land fell out of cultivation, the railways and roads were broken up, and many of the most prosperous towns were laid in ruins. Mr. Somers, who spent the latter months of 1870 and the early part of 1871 in a tour of intelligent observation in the Southern States, found, even then, that the trail of the war was everywhere visible. In the magnificent valley of the Tennessee he found 'burnt-up gin-houses, ruined bridges, mills, and factories, of which latter the gable walls are only left standing, and large tracts of once cultivated land stripped of every vestige of fencing. The roads, long neglected, are in disorder, and having in many places become impassable, new tracks have to be made through the woods and fields, without much respect to boundaries. Borne down by losses, debts, and accumulating taxes, many who were once the richest among their fellows have disappeared from the scene, and few have yet risen to take their place.' This unhappy valley is no exception; all over the South the same ruin spread. The commercial ruin was even worse. The mere money loss in the abolition of slavery was four hundred millions sterling, though the loss was one by which civilization and humanity have gained. The banking capital, estimated at two hundred millions, was, says Mr. Somers, 'swamped in the extinction of all

profitable banking business, and finally in a residuary flood of worthless Confederate money. The whole insurance capital of the South—probably a hundred millions more—also perished. The well-organized cotton, sugar, and tobacco plantations, mills, factories, coal and iron mines, and commercial and industrial establishments, built up by private capital—the value of which, in millions of pounds sterling, cannot be computed—all sank, and were engulfed in the same wave. Every form of mortgage claim, with the exception of two or three proud State stocks, shared for the time being the fate of the principal, and only now crop up amid the subsiding deluge like the stumps of a submerged forest.' But no description of these losses can so powerfully set them forth as the figures of the census returns of the value of property in 1870 as compared with 1860. The valuation of Virginia and West Virginia was $480,800,267 in 1870; it had been $657,021,336 in 1860. South Carolina had diminished in taxable value during the ten years from $489,319,128 to $174,409,491. Mississippi stood at a valuation of $509,427,912 in the year before the war; four years after the war it was valued at only $154,635,527. Louisiana fell to about half its former valuation; Florida to less than half; unfortunate Georgia to less than one third. Mr. David Wells, the late Special Commissioner of Revenue, in his last official report estimates the direct expenditure and loss of property by the Confederate States by reason of the war at $2,700,000,000. Mr. Wells thus describes the condition in which the South was left: 'In 1865 this section of our country, which in 1860 represented nearly one third of the entire population, and, omitting the value of the slaves, nearly two sevenths of the aggregate wealth of the nation, found itself, as the result of four years of civil war, entirely prostrate; without industry, without tools, without money, credit, or crops; deprived of local self-government, and to a great extent of all political privileges; the flower of its youth in the hospitals, or dead upon the battle-fields; with society disorganized, and starvation imminent or actually present. To this dark picture one darker line must be added. Southern society was demoralized by defeat. A profound discouragement settled down over the whole surface of the land. High-spirited and chivalrous as it

had been, the South might be described at the close of the war, in the language of the prophet, as "a nation scattered and peeled, a people terrible from their beginning hitherto, a nation meted out and trodden down, whose land the rivers have spoiled."' "—Pp. 77, 78.

BREAKING UP OF LARGE ESTATES.

"The first effect of the abolition of slavery has been the break-up of the great estates. In Virginia the land question occupies the foremost place. Under slavery the land was owned by slave-owners, who held large estates which they never fully cultivated, but on which they shifted their crops from one place to another, leaving the soil to recover in fallow what had been taken out of it by idle, inefficient, and wasteful culture. Under freedom they find it necessary to hold no more land than their capital will enable them to keep in cultivation; hence it is every-where being forced on the market. This land is to be bought at a price which in England would be regarded as a low sum for the annual rent. 'The landed property of a great and long-settled State,' Mr. Somers says, 'is literally going a-begging for people to come and take it.' Farms small and large, with roads and railways near them, with good society in their neighborhood and good markets for their produce, are to be had at less than four pounds an acre. One estate of eight hundred acres, 'land good, with abundance of green-sand marl only four feet below the surface,' could be bought at fifteen dollars an acre. . . . Yet, notwithstanding the diminution of the area of cultivation, the cultivation has itself so much improved as to give a relatively larger produce. Mr. Wells says of the crop which had just come in when his official report was issued: 'The new cotton is far superior in cleanliness, strength, uniformity of fiber, and absence of waste, to any ever before sent to market; while a new variety, originating in Mississippi, "the *Peeler*," has been introduced and brought to market, which commands a price from twenty-five to thirty per cent. higher than green-seed cotton of the same grade, because of the superior staple.' "—P. 80.

NEGRO PROGRESS.

"It is already abundantly evident that the prophecies which abounded during the war of the speedy extinction of the negro

race are not likely to be fulfilled. In the change from slavery to freedom the slaves suffered less than their masters. In 1860 the slave population was 3,953,760, and the free colored population numbered 488,070, a total of 4,441,830. In 1870 the free colored population was 4,880,009, an increase of nearly ten per cent. in a population which is not fed by any immigration, and which can only increase by actual natural growth. Mr. Somers says that it is admitted in all classes of Southern society that the negroes are rising to comfort, and that even a mere transient wayfarer could not help being struck by the evidence given him in the great number of colored men of the laboring class and of happy colored families that are everywhere met. But some statistics of savings prove this fact more conclusively than any observation. The Freedmen's Bureau founded a National Freedmen's Savings and Trust Company. This company has branches, or rather independent offshoots, planted in every town in the South, and the whole are under Government supervision. These savings banks have already in charge more than two millions of dollars, which are almost entirely the property of freedmen. In the office of the Charleston bank there may be seen in any forenoon a crowd of negroes paying in small sums, or withdrawing little amounts, or sending small remittances to distant relations or creditors. There were in this Charleston bank a year and a half ago 2,790 deposit accounts, of which nine tenths were kept by negroes, and the average sum to the credit of each depositor was about sixty dollars. These men usually have an object in saving; they desire to own a mule and cart, or a house, or a strip of land, or a shop, or in some way to get a sense of independence, even if it is only by the provision of a small fund to fall back on in case of sickness, old age, or accident, or to leave to their families in case of death. In the annual message which Governor Alcorn addressed to the Legislature of the State of Mississippi last year he gave some important statistics illustrating the condition of the colored people in that State. In thirty-one counties the number of marriage licenses issued to colored people was five hundred and sixty-four in the year 1865, the first year of freedom. In the following year the number rose to 3,679; in the year 1870 it was 3,427. Mr. Alcorn considers that this large number of

negro marriages, which of course includes some ratifications of unions previously contracted under slavery, is a sign of the facility with which the colored people are exchanging a condition of outlawry for a condition of civilization. The negro marriages are somewhat more prolific than those of white persons, but more of their children die young, and even the adults are not as hardy as the whites. There is a most encouraging increase in other indications of progress. The churches for a colored population of 179,677 have increased from one hundred and five in 1865 to two hundred and eighty-three in 1870; the number of schools open to a colored population of 180,527 has increased from nineteen in 1865 to one hundred and forty-eight in 1870, while the number of teachers has increased in much larger proportion. There are also signs of the gradual rise of a class of negro tenant-farmers and negro owners. Mr. Alcorn notes with regret that freedom allows many negroes to yield to drunken and dissolute habits; but over against this fact he puts another. In twenty-three counties of the State of Mississippi 40,551 bales of cotton were grown in 1869 by colored tenant-farmers, and in 1870 the produce reached 50,978 bales. In twenty counties 6,141 bales of cotton were produced in 1870 by colored owners of the soil. Small landed-proprietors, tenant-farmers, shop-keepers, teachers, preachers, are thus constituting a negro middle class, who will be the natural protectors of the vast mass below them."—P. 83.

The Reviewer rightly says that the real need of the South, which she will doubtless attain before many years, is direct trade with Europe, releasing her from her dependence upon New York. The tariff, which he describes as very oppressive upon the South, will be of little consequence if the South is wise. Slavery was the great obstacle in the way of Southern manufactures. Under a new system the South will plant her manufactories beside the cotton fields, and that dependence upon England which the reviewer calculates to be permanent will be quite as evanescent as the dependence upon New York. What the South needs is statesmen of a different type from Jefferson Davis, and political philosophers quite the reverse of Dr. Bledsoe.

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) Fourth number, 1872.—*Essays:* 1. SCHURER, The ἀρχιερεῖς (High Priests) in the New Testament. 2. GRIMM, The Problem of the First Epistle of Peter. *Remarks:* 1. BENDER, Critical Remarks on Miracles. 2. ZYRO, On Matt. vi, 11, ("Give us this day our daily bread.") 3. ZYRO, Remarks on James iv, 5. 4. SAYRE, The Besieger of Samaria. 5. SCHRADER, Reply to the preceding article. *Reviews:* 1. KAMPHAUSEN, The Pentateuch in the new Anglican Bible work. 2. SPIESS, Logos Spermaticos, reviewed by ENGELHARD.

A prefatory notice to this number of the *Studien* announces the death of Dr. C. B. Hundeshagen, one of its editors, which occurred at Bonn on June 2. A full biographical notice of the deceased scholar will be given in one of the next numbers.

The first article in the present number, which has been written by a young *privatdocent* in the theological faculty of the University of Leipzig, discusses in a very lucid and exhaustive manner the true meanings of the expression "high priests" in the New Testament. As Israel had always only *one* acting high priest at a time, exegetical writers have always found it a matter of some difficulty to explain how the New Testament could speak of a plurality of "high priests," who are clearly represented as the leading men in Israel. Most of the ancient Church fathers thought that the expression embraced solely those who really had formerly held the office of acting high priest; and, among modern writers, this view has been defended by Jost (*Geschichte des Judenthums*, 1857) and by Derenbourg, (*Essai sur l'Histoire et la Geographie de la Palestine*, t. i, 1867.) Others, like Fritzsche and Grimm, understood by this expression the heads of the twenty-four classes into which, according to 1 Chron. xxiv, the Jewish priesthood was divided. Olshausen, Meyer, and Bleek combined both views, and included in the term the acting high priests, the former high priests, and the heads of the twenty-four classes. As the New Testament generally mentions the high priests as members of the Synedrium, other writers, as Friedlieb, Langen, and Schegg, regarded "high priests" as the official name of the assistant members of the Synedrium, to which in their opinion the acting high priest and the former high priests did not belong. Dr. Haneberg, (recently appointed Bishop of Spires,) in his work on the religious antiquities of the Bible, (*Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel*, 1869,) explained the name as embracing the acting high priests, the former high priests, the clerical

members of the Synedrium, and the clerical officers of the temple. Wieseler regarded the "high priests" as the prominent men among the priests, no matter whether they were at the head of the great Sanhedrin or of other state offices; and he excluded from their number the acting high priest. Wichelhaus, in fine, understood by high priests the acting high priests, "and all those who either had formerly been invested with the office of high priest, or belonged to the privileged families to which this office was attached." Dr. Schürer briefly shows that all these views, with the exception of the first and the last, are untenable, and he then undertakes to prove that all the places of the New Testament in which the expression high priests occurs can best be explained by the adoption of the last-mentioned view, (which includes the first.) In order to prove the correctness of his explanation, this author gives the list of the twenty-eight persons who, from B. C. 37 to A. D. 70, held the office of acting high priest, with a biographical notice of each, and treats at length of the five families of Phabi, Bœthos, Kantheras, Ananos, and Kamhith, to which almost every one of these high priests belonged, and which, it seems, claimed the privilege of filling this office by rotation.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Edited by Professor A. HILGENFELD. Fourth number, 1872.—1. HILGENFELD, Contributions to the History of the "Union-Paulinism," (*Unions-Paulinism*." 2. HARMSEN, On the Doxology in Romans ix, 5. 3. GRIMM, On Luther's Translation of Jesus Sirach. 4. SEVIN, Notice of a Manuscript of the Vulgate, which has thus far been unknown to Science. 5. HILGENFELD, The so-called "Muratorian Fragment."

The so-called Muratorian Fragment is a list of the books of the New Testament which were generally accepted by the ancient Catholic Church. It is a document of very small dimensions, for it fills only one and a half leaves (leaf 10 and the first page of leaf 11) of a manuscript which on the title-page bears the name of Chrysostome, and which on the first nine leaves contains extracts from Eucherius of Lugdunum. But, notwithstanding its small dimensions, the document has a great theological interest, for it is the earliest list of the books of the New Testament which is at present extant, and it, therefore, is of incalculable importance for the history of the canon of the New Testament. Professor Hilgenfeld, in the above article, infers, from the fact that the episcopacy of the Roman bishop Pius (135 to 155) is referred to with the words "*nuper-*

rime temporibus nostris," (*very recently* in our times,) that the work to which the fragment belonged was written toward the close of the second century of the Christian era. The mention of the "Asian Kataphrygians," and the circumstance that the years are counted from Pius as Bishop of the "city of Rome," and Rome is simply designated as "the city," indicate, according to Hilgenfeld, that the book originated in the western part of the Roman Empire. The language of the Fragment is Latin; but Hilgenfeld, after the precedence of Hug and Bunsen, holds that the book was originally composed in Greek, and that we only have a Latin translation. He has previously undertaken to prove this view in his work on the Canon of the New Testament, (*Kanon und Kritik des Neuen Testamentes*,) published in 1863, in which he also published the Latin text and retranslated it into Greek. A number of learned essays have since been published on the subject. The Dane, C. E. Scharling, (*Muratori's Kanon. Den oudste fortegnelse over den Christeligen kirkes neutestam. Skrifter.* Copenhagen, 1865,) and the Germans, J. C. Laurent (*Neutestamentliche Studien.* Gotha, 1866) and E. Schrader, (in his new [eighth] edition of De Wette's "Manual of Introduction into the Old Testament." Berlin, 1869,) defend against Hilgenfeld the originality of the Latin text; while Professor G. Volkmar, of Zurich, (*Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien nach den Urkunden, laut den neueren Entdeckungen und Verhandlungen.* Zurich, 1866,) and the Dutch theologian, A. D. Loman, both of whom formerly were in favor of the Latin text, now admit with Hilgenfeld the Greek origin. A special work on the subject was published in 1867 by Tregelles, ("Canon Muratorianus; the Earliest Catalogue of the New Testament, edited, with Notes and a Fac-simile of the Manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan." Oxford,) and another new edition, by Loman, in one of the theological periodicals of Holland, (*Theologisk Tijdschrift*, 1868, II.) Comparing the results of this new literature, Hilgenfeld has published again, in the above number of the Journal for Scientific Theology, the whole of the Latin text, as well as a revision of his Greek translation, with notes, and, in conclusion, gives a brief summary of the contents. As is the case with most of the ancient documents, the true meaning of some sentences may be disputed, and other writers may put a different con-

rime temporibus nostris," (very recently in our times,) that the work to which the fragment belonged was written toward the close of the second century of the Christian era. The mention of the "Asian Kataphrygians," and the circumstance that the years are counted from Pius as Bishop of the "city of Rome," and Rome is simply designated as "the city," indicate, according to Hilgenfeld, that the book originated in the western part of the Roman Empire. The language of the Fragment is Latin; but Hilgenfeld, after the precedence of Hug and Bunsen, holds that the book was originally composed in Greek, and that we only have a Latin translation. He has previously undertaken to prove this view in his work on the Canon of the New Testament, (*Kanon und Kritik des Neuen Testaments*,) published in 1863, in which he also published the Latin text and retranslated it into Greek. A number of learned essays have since been published on the subject. The Dane, C. E. Scharling, (*Muratori's Kanon. Den ældste fortegnelse over den Christelige kirkes kanoniske Skrifter.* Copenhagen, 1865,) and the Germans, J. C. Laurent (*Neutestamentliche Studien.* Gotha, 1866) and E. Schrader, (in his new [eighth] edition of De Wette's "Manual of Introduction into the Old Testament," Berlin, 1869,) defend against Hilgenfeld the originality of the Latin text; while Professor G. Volkmar, of Zurich, (*Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien nach den Urkunden, laut den neueren Entdeckungen und Verhandlungen.* Zurich, 1866,) and the Dutch theologian, A. D. Loman, both of whom formerly were in favor of the Latin text, now admit with Hilgenfeld the Greek origin. A special work on the subject was published in 1867 by Tregelles, ("Canon Muratorianus; the Earliest Catalogue of the New Testament, edited, with Notes and a Fac-simile of the Manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan." Oxford,) and another new edition, by Loman, in one of the theological periodicals of Holland, (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1868, II.) Comparing the results of this new literature, Hilgenfeld has published again, in the above number of the Journal for Scientific Theology, the whole of the Latin text, as well as a revision of his Greek translation, with notes, and, in conclusion, gives a brief summary of the contents. As is the case with most of the ancient documents, the true meaning of some sentences may be disputed, and other writers may put a different construction upon some of the most important passages, or draw from them entirely different inferences. In the opinion of Hilgenfeld, the Muratorian Fragment mentions as biblical books recognized by the Church the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul—namely, two to the Corinthians, the Thessalonians, and Timotheus, and one each to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Galatians, the Romans, Philemon, and Titus—the First Epistle of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Second Epistle of John, (the two latter, however, as epistles written by friends of Jude and John,) and the Apocalypse of John. It also mentions an "Apocalypse of Peter," with the remark that some do not wish it to be publicly read in church. With regard to the "pastor of Hermas," it expressly states that this book did not originate in the apostolical times, that it was written by a brother of Bishop Pius of Rome, and that, therefore, it should be read, but excluded from a liturgical use, and not be received among the prophetical or apostolical writings. Of our canonical books, the Epistle of James, the two Epistles of Peter, and the Third Epistle of John are not mentioned at all. Expressly excluded from the Canon of the Catholic Church are two epistles which the Muratorian Fragment says were spuriously ascribed to Paul by the adherents of Marcion, namely, an Epistle to the Laodiceans and an epistle to the Alexandrines. The former, it is thought, was a Marcionite corruption of the canonical epistle to the Ephesians; the latter is regarded by Hilgenfeld (after the precedence of Semler and other rationalistic theologians) as being identical with the canonical epistle to the Hebrews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historical Theology.) Fourth number, 1872.—1. HERZOG, Blaise Pascal; A Sketch of his Life and his Writings. 2. KOHLER, M. Sebastian Fröschel; a Contribution to the History of the Reformation. 3. Two hitherto unknown Letters of Melanchthon, published by KOLDEWEY. 4. WALTE, Contributions to the Church History of Bremen in the Time of the Reformation.

Among the greatest men in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church undoubtedly belongs Blaise Pascal. By the nearly unanimous consent of all who have read his works he is still esteemed as a talented thinker and inventor, as the creator of the French classic prose, as one of the first promoters of the study of natural sciences in France, as one of the keenest and most eloquent apologists of the Christian religion. Inflexibly attached to the Roman Catholic Church, he was an struction upon some of the most important passages, or draw from them entirely different inferences. In the opinion of Hilgenfeld, the Muratorian Fragment mentions as biblical books recognized by the Church the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul—namely, two to the Corinthians, the Thessalonians, and Timotheus, and one each to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Galatians, the Romans, Philemon, and Titus—the First Epistle of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Second Epistle of John, (the two latter, however, as epistles written by friends of Jude and John,) and the Apocalypse of John. It also mentions an "Apocalypse of Peter," with the remark that some do not wish it to be publicly read in church. With regard to the "pastor of Hermas," it expressly states that this book did not originate in the apostolical times, that it was written by a brother of Bishop Pius of Rome, and that, therefore, it should be read, but excluded from a liturgical use, and not be received among the prophetical or apostolical writings. Of our canonical books, the Epistle of James, the two Epistles of Peter, and the Third Epistle of John are not mentioned at all. Expressly excluded from the Canon of the Catholic Church are two epistles which the Muratorian Fragment says were spuriously ascribed to Paul by the adherents of Marcion, namely, an Epistle to the Laodiceans and an epistle to the Alexandrines. The former, it is thought, was a Marcionite corruption of the canonical epistle to the Ephesians; the latter is regarded by Hilgenfeld (after the precedence of Semler and other rationalistic theologians) as being identical with the canonical epistle to the Hebrews.

Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie. (Journal for Historical Theology.) Fourth number, 1872.—1. Reuchlin, Blaise Pascal; A Sketch of his Life and his Writings. 2. Koster, Sebastian Franck; a Contribution to the History of the Reformation. 3. Two hitherto unknown Letters of Melanchthon, published by Krafft. 4. Walte, Contributions to the Church History of Bremen in the Time of the Reformation.

Among the greatest men in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church undoubtedly belongs Blaise Pascal. By the nearly unanimous consent of all who have read his works he is still esteemed as a talented thinker and inventor, as the creator of the French classic prose, as one of the first promoters of the study of natural sciences in France, as one of the keenest and most eloquent apologists of the Christian religion. Inflexibly attached to the Roman Catholic Church, he was an uncompromising opponent of Protestantism, but at the same time an untiring foe of the Jesuits, whom he denounced as the authors of false, immoral, and most dangerous doctrines. His life is of special interest at a time when again those elements in the Roman Catholic Church which are more Christian than Papal are revolting against the most monstrous of all Jesuitic innovations, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. The article in the present number of the Journal for Historical Theology, by Professor Herzog, the learned editor of the great Theological Encyclopedia of Germany, is as interesting as timely.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF FRANCE.—The year 1872 will long be memorable in the history of French Protestantism. The two State Churches of France—the Reformed and the Lutheran—after having been for more than two centuries deprived of the right of meeting in national conventions, have at length recovered a right, for the restoration of which the different Governments of the country have long been petitioned in vain. The General Synod of the Reformed Church met in Paris on June 6. It was the first General Synod of the Church since 1659, when a General Synod was held in Loudun; for the synods which are known in Church history under the name of Synods of the Desert were by no means a full representation of the Reformed Church. At the General Synod of Loudun, the royal commissary, M. de la Magdelaine, invited the Synod to transfer its powers to provincial synods, considering, he said, that in future the king would not authorize these kinds of assemblies. In reply to the commissary, the moderator of the General Synod, Daillé, bravely stood up for the right of the Church. "We admit," he said, "that we cannot convoke our general assemblies without a great deal of trouble and great expense, but as the holding of these synods is for us an absolute necessity, we gladly incur the expense and the trouble which, on its account, we have to endure. If the different subjects which are brought before these synods could be disposed of in any other way, we should gladly forego the trouble of traveling from one corner of the country to another for the purpose of holding a conference of several weeks. But as it is entirely impossible that our religion can be preserved without holding assemblies of this kind, we hope that our sovereign will permit that our deputy-general ask his Majesty to allow such assemblies to be convoked." The permission so ardently implored was not given. The Church remained without a national synod and without self-government, and, chiefly in consequence of its servile condition, it became torn by internal divisions, and reduced

to a crippled condition. The Synod was opened with a sermon of Pastor Babut, of Nimes. As the Synod contains an Orthodox and a Rationalistic party, his task was one of great difficulty; but, taking as the subject of his sermon Jesus Christ, the foundation of every Christian belief, he knew how to give satisfaction to both parties. But the proceedings of the Synod at once revealed the irreconcilable difference of the doctrinal systems of the two parties. The first important question which presented itself to the Synod was that of its own competency. Could this General Synod be regarded as the supreme representative of the Reformed Church of France, and would its decisions be valid laws for the Reformed Church? or has the Synod, on the other hand, only an advisory character, and must it be regarded as an assembly of Protestant notables convoked by the State Government for the purpose of giving information on the situation of the Church, and on the best way of introducing reforms? The Liberal party, knowing that their Orthodox opponents had a decided majority in the Synod, at once declared unanimously against the supreme authority of the Synod, which was energetically defended by the evangelical party. The Liberals took the ground that the present General Synod could not be a legal authority in the Reformed Church, because the organic articles of the law of the 18th germinal of Year X, which regulates the Constitution of the Church, do not mention the General Synod. This law only speaks of the provincial synods. Moreover, the present Synod has been elected by the provincial synods, which, in their turn, were only a delegation of the consistories. The consistories represent a highly unequal number of electors, (some not more than one thousand, others more than thirty thousand,) but, nevertheless, send the same number of delegates to the provincial synod. The General Synod, therefore, is not a fair representation of the Protestant population of France. The Orthodox party, on the other hand, urged that the law of the 18th germinal, as well as the law of 1852, expressly recognized the discipline of the Reformed Church, which, in its turn, is altogether based on the synodal presbyterian system. Portalis, in his speeches before the Council of State, alluded to the General Synod, the legality of which he implicitly recognized. This legality was also recognized by the Government of the Second Empire, which several times promised the convocation of the Synod, and by the present Government, which expressly recognized it in the decree of convocation. The boundaries of the consistories, it is admitted, greatly vary; but, in reply, it is urged that every consistory represents a kind of individuality, and that the small consistories should not be crushed by the larger ones. Moreover, what could the State Government do? Introduce, of its own accord, a new electoral system? There would have been a general outcry against such a usurpation of power. The State Government could not have acted more impartially than by restoring to the Reformed Church the right of self-government, and to leave to the highest board known to the Church, the General Synod, the final settlement of all questions of reform. The vote on the question revealed the numerical strength of the two parties. A motion by the to a crippled condition. The Synod was opened with a sermon of Pastor Babut, of Nismes. As the Synod contains an Orthodox and a Rationalistic party, his task was one of great difficulty; but, taking as the subject of his sermon Jesus Christ, the foundation of every Christian belief, he knew how to give satisfaction to both parties. But the proceedings of the Synod at once revealed the irreconcilable difference of the doctrinal systems of the two parties. The first important question which presented itself to the Synod was that of its own competency. Could this General Synod be regarded as the supreme representative of the Reformed Church of France, and would its decisions be valid laws for the Reformed Church? or has the Synod, on the other hand, only an advisory character, and must it be regarded as an assembly of Protestant notables convoked by the State Government for the purpose of giving information on the situation of the Church, and on the best way of introducing reforms? The Liberal party, knowing that their Orthodox opponents had a decided majority in the Synod, at once declared unanimously against the supreme authority of the Synod, which was energetically defended by the evangelical party. The Liberals took the ground that the present General Synod could not be a legal authority in the Reformed Church, because the organic articles of the law of the 18th germinal of Year X, which regulates the Constitution of the Church, do not mention the General Synod. This law only speaks of the provincial synods. Moreover, the present Synod has been elected by the provincial synods, which, in their turn, were only a delegation of the consistories. The consistories represent a highly unequal number of electors, (some not more than one thousand, others more than thirty thousand,) but, nevertheless, send the same number of delegates to the provincial synod. The General Synod, therefore, is not a fair representation of the Protestant population of France. The Orthodox party, on the other hand, urged that the law of the 18th germinal, as well as the law of 1852, expressly recognized the discipline of the Reformed Church, which, in its turn, is altogether based on the synodal presbyterian system. Portalis, in his speeches before the Council of State, alluded to the General Synod, the legality of which he implicitly recognized. This legality was also recognized by the Government of the Second Empire, which several times promised the convocation of the Synod, and by the present Government, which expressly recognized it in the decree of convocation. The boundaries of the consistories, it is admitted, greatly vary; but, in reply, it is urged that every consistory represents a kind of individuality, and that the small consistories should not be crushed by the larger ones. Moreover, what could the State Government do? Introduce, of its own accord, a new electoral system? There would have been a general outcry against such a usurpation of power. The State Government could not have acted more impartially than by restoring to the Reformed Church the right of self-government, and to leave to the highest board known to the Church, the General Synod, the final settlement of all questions of reform. The vote on the question revealed the numerical strength of the two parties. A motion by the

Evangelical majority, to lay the motion denying the competency of the General Synod on the table, was adopted by sixty-one against forty-one votes. The question of the authority of the General Synod having been settled, a doctrinal question at once presented itself, on which the opinions of the two parties differed still more radically. In the name of the Evangelical party, Professor Blois proposed a profession of faith, declaring that the Reformed Church "proclaims, with her fathers and her martyrs, in the confession of La Rochelle, with all the Churches of the Reformation in her symbols, the sovereign authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith, and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, only Son of God, who died for our offenses, and rose again for our justification; and that she, therefore, preserves and maintains, as the basis of her teaching, her public worship, and her discipline, the great Christian facts represented in her sacraments, celebrated in her religious solemnities, and expressed in her liturgies, more especially in the confession of sins, in the Apostles' Creed, and the liturgy of the Holy Supper." An animated debate of ten days' duration ensued upon this motion, the Liberals opposing it with all their might. It was finally adopted, (June 20th,) by a vote of sixty-one to forty-five, as the basis of the doctrine of the Church. Motions by the Liberals that the Confession of Faith should be simply communicated to the Churches under the form of a synodical letter; that it should be simply recommended to the Churches, and not obligatory upon them; and that no disciplinary consequences should follow its promulgation, were voted down by the same majority as that by which the Confession was adopted.

The following rule regarding the qualifications of electors was adopted: "An elector in the Church must declare himself attached heartily (*de cœur*) to the Protestant Reformed Church of France, and to the revealed truth as it is contained in the sacred books of the Old and New Testament." This rule received seventy-seven votes. No votes were recorded against it, but twenty-four members abstained from voting, and seven members were absent. Proposals were made by the Left for the representation of minorities in Churches in the various bodies, but they were not acceded to.

On Saturday, July 6th, the following rule was adopted, in reference to the admission of candidates for the ministry: "Every candidate for the ministry in the Reformed Church of France must adhere to the faith of the Church as defined by the General Synod at the beginning of the session." This received sixty-two votes to thirty-nine cast against it; seven members were absent.

The general effect of the action of the Synod is to permit the Unitarian members and ministers to remain in the Church, and to vote upon declaring attachment to the Church and the revealed truth of the Old and New Testaments, but to prevent the ordination, in the future, of ministers who will not subscribe to the Confession of Faith.

The following resolution, on the separation of Church and State, was agreed to: "The Synod, considering that the principle of the reciprocal independence of the Churches and of the State ought to be introduced into modern public law; considering that the Reformed Church of France is

disposed for its part to accept with confidence its separation from the State when the Government shall deem it necessary for all religious bodies, the Synod deems it well to urge the Church to prepare for this separation."

The synodal presbyterian form of government was decided upon. The pastors are to be nominated by a presbyterial council. The consistory is to have the right of veto. When this right is exercised, the case may be referred to the provincial synod, and to the General Synod, as the highest authority. A rule prescribing the ability to read and write as an essential qualification of voters after the 1st of January, 1875, was adopted unanimously.

The Synod was visited by representatives of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, who congratulated it on its resuming its meetings under a liberal Government.

It is represented that the Unitarian party is stronger in the Churches than it appeared in the Synod.

The second of the Protestant State Churches of France, the Lutheran, received, like the Reformed Church, the permission of holding again a General Synod. It was convoked by the Government to meet in Paris on July 23, and consisted of thirty-three members, twenty-two laymen, and eleven clergymen—fifteen representing the "Inspection" of Paris, and eighteen that of Montbéliard or Mompelgard. The special task to be accomplished by the Lutheran General Synod was the re-organization of the Lutheran State Church of France, which has nearly been destroyed by the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. Before the war the Lutheran Church numbered forty-four consistories, with two hundred and seventy-eight parishes. Now, only six consistories are left, with sixty-four parishes, of which eight are in Paris, forty-seven in the district of Montbéliard, one in Lyons, one in Nice, and seven in Algeria. The establishment of three more parishes—two in Paris and one in Algeria—has been promised by the Government. Besides this overwhelming majority of its consistories and parishes, the Lutheran Church has lost its supreme ecclesiastical board, its theological faculty and theological seminary, all of which were located at Strasburg, as well as an evangelical gymnasium, and a number of rich dotations in the same city. Thus this Church has been reduced to about one fifth of its former dimensions. Soon after the conclusion of peace, the Minister of Public Worship wished to convoke a Synod for the re-organization of the Lutheran Church; but the Inspection of Montbéliard showed a decided opposition to this step. The great majority of the pastors of this Inspection belong to the Liberal party, and desire to separate from the Inspection of Paris, which is orthodox, and to unite with the Reformed Church, in which, for a long time, no confession of faith had been regarded of an obligatory character. This party established a religious paper, called "La Situation Ecclesiastique," the outspoken aim of which was to bring on a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, with entire absence of any official creed. On October 18 a general assembly of the Inspection of Mompelgard took place. Of the seventy-eight members

who were present, fifty-nine voted for the union, and only nineteen against it. Both the majority and the minority sent delegates to Paris, to ask the Minister to adjourn the re-organization of the Church. The Minister agreed to leave every thing in its former condition until the clergymen would arrive at a better understanding with each other. Soon after, on November 29, the General Synod of the Reformed Church was convoked, and the Lutherans generally concluded to wait until the close of this Synod before taking new steps with regard to their own Church. The strictly Lutheran minority of Mompelgard closely united with the Inspection of Paris, and thereby gained new strength. The majority, which was in favor of a union with the Reformed, split on the doctrinal question, as those leaning toward Pietism were dissatisfied with the attacks, by the champions of the Liberal party, upon the authority of the Bible and the Apostolical Creed. After the majority of the General Synod of the Reformed Church had declared in favor of an obligatory confession of faith, the Rationalistic Lutherans were shaken in their longing for a union, and the Pietists remained the only advocates of a union. The Inspection of Paris, on the other hand, took a decided stand in favor of preserving the independence of the Lutheran Church. Their organ is the paper "La Temoiguage," of Paris. A minority in Paris favors a union with the Reformed Church, but in view of the grave dissensions in the Reformed Church prefers to make no advances in this direction at present. Moreover, the emigration of large numbers of Lutherans from Alsace and Lorraine appeared to make it more necessary than ever to preserve the Lutheran Church. The congregations of Lyons and Nice also strongly urge this view. The Lutheran clergymen of France appear generally anxious not to fall out with their co-religionists in Germany.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

UNDER the title of *Deutsche Zeit-und Streitfragen*, a series of pamphlets has been begun in Germany, each of which will discuss one important question of the age on which the opinions of mankind are greatly divided. The editors of the collection are Professor Von Holtzendorff, of Berlin, and Professor W. Oncken. Important religious controversies fall within the scope of the new enterprise, as well as literary, and others. The very first pamphlet, which begins the series, is one on the Life of Jesus and the Church of the Future, (*Das Leben Jesu und die Kirche der Zukunft*. Berlin, 1872.) The author, Heinrich Lang, a clergyman of the Reformed Church of Switzerland, has long been known in the theological literature of Germany as one of the leaders of the extreme Rationalistic party. He gives in popular language a brief summary of the results of the critical school of Tübingen, and the books of the New Testament are, in his opinion, not an unbiased record of the life of Jesus, but they are all

written in a bitter party spirit, from the stand-point either of the liberal Pauline party or of the Judaizing Christians. He regards it as the mission of theological science to evolve from the parti-colored statements of the New Testament writers the true picture of the Great Founder of the universal Christian religion. Another of the pamphlets of this collection, which have already appeared, is by Professor Schulte, of Prague, the learned writer on Church law, and present champion of the Old Catholics. It treats of the monastic orders and congregations of the Roman Catholic Church, with particular reference to Germany, (*Die neueren kathol. Orden und Congregationen besonders in Deutschland.* Berlin, 1872,) and warns the German Governments and States against the dangers with which they are threatened by the ultramontane tendencies of the Jesuits, and other orders. Among the pamphlets of the collection, which are announced as soon forthcoming, are the following: Prof. Stahl, History of the Labor Question; Prof. Baumgarten, of Rostock, Protestantism as a Political Principle; Prof. J. B. Meyer, of Bonn, The Reformation of the German Universities; Prof. Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, The German Empire and Science. Contributions on theological or ecclesiastical questions may also be expected from Prof. Frohschammer, of Munich; Prof. Hinschius, of Berlin; Prof. Huber, of Munich; Prof. Schenkel, of Heidelberg; Prof. Wasserschleben, Prof. Zeller, and many others.

A pamphlet, by Dr. Gustav Eberty, "On the Relation of the State to Popular Education," (*Ueber das Verhältniss des Staates zur Volkserziehung.* Berlin, 1872,) gives an outline of the history of the relation of the State to public education from the earliest times to the present age. The duty of the State to legislate on and to superintend the education of the youth was, even before Christ, advocated by Plato and Aristotle. The Roman Catholic Church denies the right of the State to meddle with education; but the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century established the public school, the great institution of modern civilization, upon a firm basis. The school question is at present the subject of a more animated discussion than at any previous period, and the author calls on all the educated classes to take an active interest in this question.

"The Philosophy of the Earl of Shaftesbury; with an Introduction, and a Critique of the Relation of Religion to Philosophy, and of Philosophy to Science," (*Die Philosophie des Grafen von Shaftesbury.* Freiburg, 1872,) is the title of a book published by Prof. Spiker. After a biographical introduction and a literary review, the main portion of the work discusses, n four sections, the relations of the famous English freethinker to religion and Christianity, to morality, to philosophy, and to art and literature.

Dr. Kamphausen, Professor in the Faculty of Evangelical Theology at the University of Bonn, has published an exegetical and critical monograph on the Lord's Prayer, (*Das Gebet des Herrn.* Elberfeld, 1872.) The author delivered a lecture on this subject to the Pastoral Conference of Bonn, and, at the request of the Conference, published it as a book. It

is especially intended as a scientific aid for the clergymen and teachers who explain the Lord's Prayer in a course of religious instruction.

The Catholic publishing house of Herder, in Freiburg, announce the forthcoming publication of a "Theological Library," which is to contain a new manual of every branch of theological science. It is based on the same plan as the theological library published in this country by Prof. H. B. Smith and Prof. Ph. Schaff. The following volumes, among others, will form part of the series: "Encyclopedia," by Prof. Hagemann, of Hildesheim; "Apologetics," by Prof. Hettinger, of Würzburg; an "Introduction into the Old and New Testaments," by Professor Kaulen, of Bonn; a "Church History," by Prof. Hergenröther, of Würzburg; "Dogmatics," by Scheeben; "History of Christian Doctrines," by Wildt; a manual of "Church Law," by Prof. Vering, of Heidelberg; "Pastoral Theology, Catechetics, and Homiletics," by Kleinheidt; "Pedagogics," by Hirschfelder. Some of the authors mentioned in this list are well-known as able scholars; others have thus far only been known for their fanatical zeal in behalf of the Church of Rome. The volumes of the series are, therefore, likely to be of very unequal value.

Another new Catholic publication, of probably considerable value, which is announced as forthcoming, is an Encyclopedia of Christian Antiquities, (*Real-Encyclopædie der Christl. Alterthümer*,) likewise to be published by Herder, of Freiburg. It is to be edited by Professor Kraus, of the University of Strasburg, with the assistance of Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, A. von Reumont, and others. The name of the chief editor and of his contributors are a guarantee that this encyclopedia will contain a number of valuable articles.

The German translation of select writings of the Church fathers, which is edited by Prof. Thalhofer, of Munich, (*Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*,) and to which we have occasionally called attention in former numbers of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, contains, besides the Latin and Greek fathers, also translations from some writers of the ancient Syriac Church. A large portion of the literature of the ancient Syriac Church has only recently been discovered in Oriental convents, and it is expected that many additions to this literature will yet be found. As but few persons have a sufficient knowledge of the Syriac language to read these works in the original, translations into one of the principal modern languages will be welcome to many theologians of all Christian denominations. The above "Library of the Church Fathers," after giving, some years ago, several volumes of translations of the Church father Ephrem, of Edessa, the best known of all Syriac writers, has recently published a volume of "Select Poems of the Syriac Church Fathers, Cyrillonas, Balaeus, and Isaac, of Antioch," (*Ausgewählte Gedichte der Syrischen Kirchenväter Cyrillonas, etc.* Kempten, 1872,) now for the first time translated into German, by Prof. G. Bickell, of Munster. The translator is generally regarded as one of the best—perhaps the best—Syriac scholar now living; and although he shows himself biased in favor of the Roman Catholic

doctrines, his introduction and notes to the three writers mentioned are declared, even by the most competent Protestant reviewers, as very valuable. A second volume will contain poems of Jacob, of Sarug.

An Arabic work on the doctrines of Mohammedanism concerning the future life has been translated into German by a Jewish rabbi, Dr. M. Wolff, (*Mohammedanische Eschatologie.* Leipzic, 1872.) The work gives what even now all the Mohammedans believe with regard to the future life, much of which cannot strictly be called Mohammedan doctrine; for, according to the Mohammedan creed, nothing is necessary for salvation but a full belief in all that is contained in the Koran, and in all that a well-authenticated tradition proves to have been taught by the Prophet Mohammed himself. The translator has added notes, investigating the relation of the Mohammedan creed on this subject with Jewish notions.

Prof. H. Schmid has begun a publication of a History of the Catholic Church of Germany, from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present age, (*Geschichte der Kathol. Kirche Deutschlands.* Munich, 1872.) The work is to be completed in two volumes. A work on this subject was a great want in Germany, but the author appears to have thus far not satisfied the expectations of scholars.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Suggestive Inquiries concerning the Resurrection of the Dead, as taught in the New Testament. By D. A. DRYDEN. 16mo., pp. 215. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, for the Author. 1872.

We agree with Dr. Briggs in his brilliant Introduction to this little volume, that an honest discussion of our ordinary beliefs, which "does not impair the force of Christian motives," must, though freely handled, be liberally accepted. Yet we regret to say that there are in this book not a few slants at "the theologies" and "cherished creed," which better become what Dr. M'Cosh calls the "Boston Theology" than an evangelical Methodist preacher, whose heart is in sympathy with the Christian consciousness of the great body of the true Catholic Church of all ages. Doctrinal tradition is not to be our master, but still deserves respectful treatment as one of our guides in attaining the true sense of Scripture, and the vague depreciation of "creeds" and "theologies" is rather new in our Methodism. This general evangelical Church has made the word of God its guide; the "central creeds" are her historic doctrinal records; and when a writer claims that his individual comment on the

word is essentially the word itself, in contradistinction to the nearly unanimous exposition of the great body of acknowledged standards, (which, forsooth, are mere opinions,) he shows an arrogance that nearly forfeits a right to our attention. Especially insufferable is all this when the doctrine, like that of the bodily resurrection, is one to which not only Methodism, but all Christendom, whether Greek, Roman, or Protestant, has given its unanimous assent in the most pronounced terms; an assent not only during the modern and middle ages, but through the martyr age, as attested by the most primitive creeds, by the inscriptions on the tombs of the Catacombs, by the earliest uninspired writings, and so in all presumption by the words of the apostles and of Christ, where such an interpretation of their words is even allowable. Dissent on this point, save by an occasional writer or by heretical sects, is unknown. Nor is the force of this unanimity at all broken by the fact that when orthodox writers have voluntarily gone beyond the proposition of the simple doctrine, and entered into explanatory details and incidentals about the process of the resurrection, their individual views have varied in numerous directions; for that is true of all doctrines—even of the atonement itself. It is of no use, then, for Mr. Dryden to spread out upon his pages the numerous subordinate peculiarities of writers on the resurrection, so long as from the present moment back to the apostolic day the Church has with singular and most articulate unanimity been able to say, "*I believe in the* RESURRECTION OF THE BODY," meaning by "the body" the body that died. Backed by such a unanimity upon this one great PROPOSITION, we enter the New Testament with a justly powerful, though not absolute, presumption in our favor; and we surely have some right to expect in our opponent great modesty of speech and temper, and great decisiveness of exegesis and logic, to overcome such a presumption. Neither of these qualities seems remarkably conspicuous in this volume. Its theory is, so far as we understand it, that at the death of the body the soul takes so much from the body with it as will form a soul-body and thus constitute a complete personality, and it thence departs to hades, the place of departed spirits. At the advent it will therefore *rise* a complete person—not from the earth, but from *hades*—and ascend to the eternal heaven. Such being the theory, it is all important for the theorist to show then that the *dead* that *rise* are not the *dead bodies* in the earth, but—what? The reply is at once a refutation of this whole theory. They, those "resurrected" *dead*, are the LIVING *persons* in hades! Mr. Dryden's real resurrection, there-

fore, is a resurrection of the already *living*, and consists in their *ascension* from hades or paradise to heaven. His rising *dead* are the *living!* His is therefore no resurrection *of the dead.* The compound person that rises, by his theory, not only is not dead the moment before, but in fact never was dead.

To prove that *the dead* that are in Scripture said to rise are not *dead bodies*, (which really disproves the resurrection of the dead!) he takes the texts in which the dead are said to *rise*, and in the place of the word *dead* or its pronoun he substitutes the words *dead bodies;* and as the text then reads incongruously, he infers that the word *dead* does not mean *dead bodies.* Thus:

> "Questioning one with another what the rising from the *dead bodies* should mean?" "Brought again from the *dead bodies* our Lord Jesus Christ;" "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all the *dead bodies* that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they (*dead bodies*) that have done good unto the resurrection of life; they (*dead bodies*) that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," John v, 28, 29; "Jesus, who is the first begotten of the *dead bodies*," Rev. i, 5; "But the rest of the *dead bodies* lived not again," Rev. xx, 5; "Blessed are the *dead bodies* that die in the Lord," Rev. xiv, 13.

Now we will give him a few more texts of the same sort. Abraham, speaking of the corpse of Sarah, says to the sons of Heth (Gen. xxiii): "If it be your minds that I should bury *my dead* (*my dead body?*) out of my sight," etc. Now we know here that *my dead* does signify *my dead body;* and yet to substitute the latter phrase would change the meaning. Matt. viii, 22: "Let *the dead* bury their dead" would not well read, Let the dead bodies bury their dead bodies; and yet that is the literal image underlying the figure. Matt. x, 8: "Raise the dead" means certainly a raising performed upon *dead bodies* by the recall of their souls; but the text would not read well, Raise the *dead bodies.* Matt. xi, 5: "The dead are raised up" certainly signifies that *dead bodies* are raised up from their prostrate state by being reanimated with the returning soul.* It is in every case the body that is raised; it is a bodily resurrection, and the requisite condition of that bodily resurrection is its reanimation by the soul from hades. Similarly we affirm that in every passage quoted by Mr. Dryden the word *dead* does refer to the *dead bodies* in the earth, and does not refer to the soul or soul-person in hades. The uncouthness of the reading arises not

---

* And as in these passages the bodies (Greek neuter) alone are called *οἱ νεκροὶ*, (Greek masculine plural,) and are raised under condition of the returning souls, so we have a contradiction to Mr. Dryden's repeated statements that this word always (for he must mean *always* if he means any thing to his purpose) "takes in the whole idea of personal being." In every one of these cases the masculine Greek plural for *dead*, or *dead bodies*, is applied to bodies or corpses.

from any inconsistency of meaning. It arises from a violation of the ordinary idiom of speech, yet that idiom having its origin in a real association of thought. When, for instance, Dr. Young speaks of "the pale nations of the dead," he means not living souls in hades, for he would not call them *pale*, but he means collectively the *dead bodies.* Yet "pale nations of the dead bodies" would read ludicrously. Why? Because the phrase "the *dead*" has a more elevated tone than the phrase *dead bodies.* The dead in the graves are not merely so many *dead bodies*, but are taken as a collective community, a dread domain, and even a state. Thus, when Christ rose in body from the dead, the image is not that he rose from among a parcel of individual dead bodies, but that he rose from the solemn society, the collective state, of the inanimate.

Mr. Dryden expends a great deal of Greek erudition on the fact that *the dead*, as deceased bodies, have a Greek neuter σωμα, and yet the personal masculine *νεκροί*, and other adjectives or pronouns and participles, are applied to *the dead.* These masculines, he imagines, cannot accord with neuter dead bodies, and so they must require the soul in order to constitute a *person.* Yet the most ordinary Greek grammar will tell him that a masculine agrees (*ad sensum* as the grammarians say) with a neuter Greek word that designates a personal being. So in Matt. xxvii, 52, 53: "Many bodies [*σώματα*, *bodies*, neuter] arose, and *coming* [Greek masculine participle agreeing with the neuter *bodies*] out of the *graves* [same word as in John v and John xi] went into the holy city." It was purely a bodily resurrection by the incoming of the soul; bodies (neuter) are the only subject of participle and verb; and yet the participle agrees in the masculine plural with these *bodies.* We have above shown that in Matt. viii, 22, and x, 8, and xi, 5, dead bodies are called by the masculine *νεκροί.* The dead body of Lazarus is called by his personal name. The whole pretense that bodies alone cannot be mentioned as *persons* is contradicted in all languages by every-day life. A man's corpse is still spoken of as a man, a woman's corpse as being a woman. All the relative words of personality are in myriads of cases applied to the lifeless body. No one would hesitate to speak of the corpse of a daughter as a female person: "She lies in her coffin, but she will come forth;" or of a son: "He is cold in death, but he will rise to immortality." In vain will Mr. Dryden stand by, grammar in hand, and say: "The word *she* is personal and feminine, and cannot mean or agree with that dead corpse; it must designate the soul in hades with its soul-body, so as to from any inconsistency of meaning. It arises from a violation of the ordinary idiom of speech, yet that idiom having its origin in a real association of thought. When, for instance, Dr. Young speaks of "the pale nations of the dead," he means not living souls in hades, for he would not call them *pale*, but he means collectively the *dead bodies*. Yet "pale nations of the dead bodies" would read ludicrously. Why? Because the phrase "the dead" has a more elevated tone than the phrase *dead bodies*. The dead in the graves are not merely so many *dead bodies*, but are taken as a collective community, a dread domain, and even a state. Thus, when Christ rose in body from the dead, the image is not that he rose from among a parcel of individual dead bodies, but that he rose from the solemn society, the collective state, of the inanimate.

Mr. Dryden expends a great deal of Greek erudition on the fact that *the dead*, as deceased bodies, have a Greek neuter *soma*, and yet the personal masculine *nekroi*, and other adjectives or pronouns and participles, are applied to *the dead*. These masculines, he imagines, cannot accord with neuter dead bodies, and so they must require the soul in order to constitute a *person*. Yet the most ordinary Greek grammar will tell him that a masculine agrees (*ad sensum* as the grammarians say) with a neuter Greek word that designates a personal being. So in Matt. xxvii, 52, 53: "Many bodies [*somata*, *bodies*, neuter] arose, and *coming* [Greek masculine participle agreeing with the neuter *bodies*] out of the graves [same word as in *John* v and John xi] went into the holy city." It was purely a bodily resurrection, by the incoming of the soul; bodies (neuter) are the only subject of participle and verb; and yet the participle agrees in the masculine plural with these *bodies*. We have above shown that in Matt. viii, 22, and x, 8, and xi, 5, dead bodies are called by the masculine *nekroi*. The dead body of Lazarus is called by his personal name. The whole pretense that bodies alone cannot be mentioned as *persons* is contradicted in all languages by every-day life. A man's corpse is still spoken of as a man, a woman's corpse as being a woman. All the relative words of personality are in myriads of cases applied to the lifeless body. No one would hesitate to speak of the corpse of a daughter as a female person: "She lies in her coffin, but she will come forth;" or of a son: "He is cold in death, but he will rise to immortality." In vain will Mr. Dryden stand by, grammar in hand, and say: "The word *she* is personal and feminine, and cannot mean or agree with that dead corpse; it must designate the soul in hades with its soul-body, so as to include the whole person. Certainly you do not mean that a mere *dead body* will come forth! And how can a *dead body* rise to immortality? If it is dead it cannot be immortal. A dead body cannot live at all." This is no caricature of the great mass of the reasoning of this volume. And if personal terms are thus normally applied to dead corpses, much more may they be applied to the same corporeities passing through the successive stages of *death*, *animation*, *coming forth*, and *completed resurrection*. Thus 1 Thess. iv, 14, 15: "Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. We which are alive shall not prevent them which are asleep; and the dead in Christ shall rise first," etc. Mr. D. does not accomplish a great deal when he paraphrases this thus: "Even so the *dead bodies* which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him; *we* which are alive shall not prevent the *dead bodies* which sleep in Jesus; and the *dead bodies* in Christ shall rise first, and the *dead bodies* shall be raised incorruptible." As it happens, the phrase *dead bodies* does not occur in the passage; but simply personal terms which are equally susceptible of being applied to *bodies* or to *persons* through all their stages from corpses to glorified personalities, as the same personal but varying subject.

And this answers the argument from the words, "How are they [the dead] raised up, and with what body do they come?" On this our author remarks: "Is it possible to limit *the dead* to mean bodies?" Suppose, we reply, the text were, "How is Lazarus raised up? with what body does he come?" Every one can see that the personal name "Lazarus" applies *to* the *dead body*, and yet in the same breath the person Lazarus comes *with* his risen body.

Of nearly every leading position taken in the book a square contradiction could be furnished from the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus alone. He says (p. 29) that the dead body of Christ is not Christ, and yet the dead body of Lazarus before being revivified is addressed by Christ himself as "*Lazarus*." John xi, 43. He says that the personal pronoun is not applicable to the dead *soma*, and yet it is, (v. 33.) He tells us that in John v, 29, the word *graves* means tombs, and must be made to mean figuratively *hades;* but the same word, as used xi, 31 and 38, is applied to Lazarus's burial-place, and it is said that "it was a *στήλαιον*," cave, or *little excavation*, (the Greek word is a diminutive term,) covered by "a stone." So that this little stone-covered hole must be figuratively so enlarged as to take in the whole invisible region of departed spirits, both hades and paradise included!

That the earth, not hades, is the scene of resurrection, and that the bodies are *the dead* which are raised, are decisively proved by Rev. xx, 13: "The sea gave up *the dead* which were in it." Mr. D. protests against the "literal interpretation of *the sea*," and asserts that if the *dead* means *dead bodies*, then, in v. 12, "the dead were judged" means a judgment of *dead bodies*. But, we reply, when it is affirmed that the *dead were judged*, the idiom is just the same as when it is said, Matt. xi, 5, "The deaf hear;" not that they were *deaf* and *heard* at the same time, but that the previously *deaf* now hear. So Matt. xv, 31, the multitudes saw the dumb speak, the lame walk, and the blind see. Not that they were blind and seeing at the same time, but in succession. So the judged were not *dead* and *judged* at the same time, but the previously *dead* are now *judged.*

These considerations will disperse the imaginary difficulties which Mr. D. gathers around John v, 28, 29: "All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life," etc. This pictures the process of bodies in their graves being reanimated, and coming forth into a complete retributive resurrection state. The *graves*, or tombs, signify *graves*, or tombs, and nothing else. Nor is there any thing ungrammatical in the dead occupants of those graves being called by the Greek masculine plural word for *dead*, mere *bodies* at the beginning of the process though they were. The neuter word for *bodies* does not in fact occur in the text; and this is one of the million cases in which the dead body of a man is spoken of as a man or person. When asked, How could the dead hear? we reply, just as the deaf hear. Simultaneously with the *voice* come the soul and the sensibility. No sophistry can evade this text. It proves, defying all perversion, that the scene of the resurrection is the earth; that its subjects are the bodies dead and normally buried; that it consists in the reorganization of those self-same material bodies into glorious modifications preparatory for the ascension to the judgment-seat of the Son of man.

Our remarks are lengthened not in proportion to the value of the book, which is (with all personal kindness to the author) very slight, but to the importance of the subject. We cannot indorse Dr. Briggs's recommendation to *read* the book, as that would usually be a waste of time. We are pleased to note that though printed at one of our publishing houses, it bears no official imprint.

God with us; or, The Person and Work of Christ, with an Examination of "The Vicarious Sacrifice" of Dr. Bushnell. By ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., President of Newton Theological Institution. 12mo., pp. 275. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co.

Dr. Hovey has attained an eminence among American theologians for his lucidity as a writer and his acumen as a metaphysician. It is a great pleasure to study his pages where we agree with him; and even where we disagree, as we occasionally and very widely do, we are not a little obliged to him for the clearness, candor, and living spirit with which he states and defends the wrong side.

He expounds and maintains, in the first part, the true doctrine of the divine-human person of Christ with a masterly precision. Our students in theology will find this part a tract for the times against the new heresy that asserts the Infinite to have literally minified itself to the finite in order to become the pseudo-human soul of Christ. Such a doctrine, as we have heretofore said, denies the necessary existence of God in the absolute, undiminishable fullness of his attributes, and so makes him capable of self-annihilation. God's existence is then no longer a necessary truth. God, we hold, can never *sleep*, in part or in whole; he can become latent to us, but he can never be latent to himself; and this latency *to us* is all the self-inanition there is in the incarnation. Dr. Hovey's illustration of the unity of the divine and human consciousness in the "one Christ" is clear and beautiful. In discussing the atonement itself Dr. Hovey shows that his heart is broader than his creed. His creed is that of explicit Calvinism—particular, *personal* election, based on a particular, *personal* redemption through the atonement. Writing, as he originally did, these chapters in a Baptist periodical, he assumes that his audience is as Calvinistic as himself. For instance, he says: "It is plain that God purposed from the first to save certain persons of our race; that those persons were given to Christ in a special sense to be his flock, and that he had particularly in view their actual salvation when he laid down his life. Thus far, at least, it would seem as if there could be no question as to the sense of Scripture." Certainly not among his Calvinistic readers; but three fourths, at least, of the Christian Church of all ages, east and west, are not Calvinists, and very promptly reject such a view.

Dr. Hovey nevertheless endeavors to convince himself that he believes in an unlimited atonement. By the atonement "it was the eternal desire and purpose of God to remove from every sinner's path the only obstacle to his salvation except his own

impenitence and unbelief." And yet Dr. Hovey firmly believes that God has eternally foreordained, irrespective of any foreknowledge, whatsoever comes to pass. That is, He has absolutely and immutably predetermined and decided before the ages that the whole human race, except the above "certain persons," should continue impenitent, should reject the atonement, and be forever damned. God has also taken omniscient care to hem in their wills with strongest motives for sin and impenitence, which "strongest motives" exclude all "power of contrary choice," and necessitate the choice for sin and damnation. Now, that a theologian who believes all that should still imagine that he also believes that the atonement removes all obstacles to the sinner's salvation except his own impenitence, is one of the curiosities of the human intellect. Surely there are some obstacles back of that impenitence which the atonement does not remove. There is the immutable decree of Jehovah, and there is the adamantine causation of volitional necessity, fastening their pitiable victim to sin and eternal death. Such theology mismanages the cause of God and flings the right upon the sinner's side. God is thus the only sinner, and such a God, did the infinite Monster exist, would deserve all the damnation.

Critical History and Defense of the Old Testament Canon. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. 12mo., pp. 422. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1872.

Professor Stuart was an eminent pioneer in the field of sacred literature in our country, but, pioneer as he was, his works have still a standard character, not superseded by the productions of his followers in the same area. Especially was he the bold raider into the territories of German neology, and obliged, mostly by his own single brain-power, to think his route through the intricate region. He would have lost his way, but that his *heart* was too deeply true to Christ. At this distance of time he seems undiminished in the stature of his greatness. We look over the Andover catalogue of books, and recognize many a monument raised by his consecrated learning and talent, but not one fitting memorial by any reverent hand to his memory. We suggest to the Andover brethren whether Christian biography might not be enriched by a life of Moses Stuart.

The present volume is a print from the plates of an English edition edited by the erudite but wayward scholar, Dr. Davidson. Davidson's notes are mostly replaced by substitutes from the American editor. The work itself covers ground unoccupied, in

the same form and extent, by any other English or American work. And yet it is ground with which not only every biblical scholar, but every well-trained minister, ought to be familiar. The formation and authenticity of the Bible are the very foundations of our theology.

The scope of his work is to give the earliest origin and history of the Old Testament Books, and to identify them with the canon quoted and indorsed by our Lord and his apostles. The reader is led to range over the literature and the intellectual state of the Hebrew race through successive ages. The sacred books have the disadvantage of their great antiquity, as being for centuries alone, anterior to the testimony of any other contemporary literature, attested almost solely by themselves. But clearly, and more clearly, it becomes evident to the critical eye that that self-attestation is ample. Sanskrit literature, the monuments of Egypt, nay, Greek literature itself, in its early ages, are self-attesting and yet unquestionable.

There is just enough of polemic to give life and point to the present volume. It is living discussion. Stuart is alert for every opponent, near or distant; but the spirit of fairness, of rather under- than over-statement, pervades his pages. His statement of the nature and origin of the canon, its preservation and identity, its closing up, and attestations in later literature, is clear and candidly conclusive. It is followed by an appendix, in which all the testimonies identifying the canon are given, from Josephus to Augustine, both in the Greek and in the English translation. Had the despotism of stereotype plates allowed, the work would have well borne a body of additional notes from a competent hand, furnishing the results of the latest researches and developments.

The Resurrection of Christ. A Series of Discourses. By ELIPHALET NOTT, D.D., LL.D., late President of Union College. With an Introduction and Notes by TAYLER LEWIS. 12mo., pp. 157. New York: Scribner & Armstrong. 1872.

Dr. Nott was a splendid pulpit rhetorician of the Massillon school; yet a subtile aroma of genius ran through his performances not to be caught by an imitator. We well remember the fascination his volume of Baccalaureate Addresses exercised over undergraduates in our young day, rivaling, as they did, the speeches of Councilor Charles Phillips in gorgeousness of verbiage. The present volume is to be read, not as a convincing argument for the closet, but as a specimen of popular argumentative persuasion, in which the emotional is a legitimate aid. We

fully agree with Professor Lewis that the historical argument, rhetorically stated by Dr. Nott, is unanswerable. It is fashionable at the present day to depreciate Paley, but it is impossible to refute him. This is true of both his Evidences and his Natural Theology. Both at the present day need some supplemental additions; but, in their solid bulk, as the historical argument for Christianity, and as the causational argument for theism, both are impregnable. But when it is a conclusive statement of the argument on either of these topics that is wanted, we immensely prefer Paley to Nott, just as many a listening and entranced audience immensely preferred Nott to Paley.

The Life that Now is. Sermons by ROBERT COLLYER, Author of "Nature and Life." Pp. 351. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

This is the first of Robert Collyer's pages we have looked over, and found subject for more genuine admiration than we had expected. From chance paragraphs that we had seen extracted in the newspapers we had expected to find him ferociously determined to be sensationally smart. But there is a mellowness of thought, and a free, spontaneous flow of style vindicating his claim to a character for genius without any determined extravaganzas. There is left in his soul, too, a true reverence for Jesus as an exceptional Being, and for the Bible as a book sole and superior, a reverence which may do immense good to those whom a higher truth cannot effectually reach. There is also a power of unique trains of thought, of unfolding reflection in fresh direction from slight hints, which, though sometimes of questionable validity, are often streams of wisdom. Not often do we see anything in this line finer than the "Gashmu" of the present volume.

Sermons by the Rev. De Witt C. Talmage, delivered in the Brooklyn Tabernacle. 12mo., pp. 405. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Mr. Talmage's sermons are not prepared for the scrutiny of the closeted critic, and so present many passages which do not bear cool analysis. On the other hand, he is not a mere sensationalist, with no other purpose than to raise an hour's excitement, of which *self* is the hero. He is earnest, catholic, realistic, evangelical, straining every power to attain *the* legitimate objects of a true ministry, the conquest over sin, the triumph of truth and holiness. In that great enterprise a true Christian criticism, in spite of errors of detail, will stand by him. His powers of thought and language are great, and are applied with the devotion of his

entire manhood to the service of the great Head of the Church. His sermons are after no model, and are model for nobody else. They are worthy to be read for their quickening power, and the truths they teach are powerful to salvation.

The Sermons of Henry Ward Beecher in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. From Verbatim Reports, by J. J. ELLINWOOD. "Plymouth Pulpit," Fifth Series: September, 1870–March, 1871. Sixth Series: March–September, 1871. 2 vols. 8vo., pp. 451, 514. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1872.

Yale Lectures on Preaching. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. Delivered before the Theological Department of Yale College, New Haven, Conn., as the First Series in the Regular Course of the "Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching." From Phonographic Reports. 12mo., pp. 263. New York: J. B. Ford and Co. 1872.

The little book on Preaching is one of Mr. Beecher's happiest performances. It is colloquial, but the colloquy of a master. It is brilliant, with a very uncommon amount of common sense. It is the first volume on homiletics we ever read which it was not a task to read. We wish our young preachers would *begin* to read it, and we are sure they will finish it, and will know a considerable amount more about their own business than they did before.

The Mission of the Spirit; or, The Office and Work of the Comforter in Human Redemption. By Rev. LEWIS R. DUNN, Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, United States. Edited by Rev. JOSEPH BUSH. 16mo., pp. 176. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1872.

An English edition of Mr. Dunn's eloquent and stirring treatise, published under the supervision of William Arthur and Gervase Smith. It is in a very neat and attractive form. The work should be scattered broadcast, on both sides of the Atlantic, as a quickener of believers in the Christian life.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Agreement of Science and Revelation. By JOSEPH WYTHE, M.D. 12mo., pp. 290. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. New York: Nelson & Phillips. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

As a theologian and physiologist Dr. Wythe possesses advantages for skillfully handling the points of contact between religion and science. The volume is a course of lectures delivered by him as president of a literary institution. It aims to be popular rather than exhaustive, being written in a free and flowing style, and, so far forth as it is technical in its terms, the unscientific reader is aided by a glossary at the end. At a time when men of talent

are, under the guise of science, endeavoring to undermine the public faith, this book is a timely contribution to prove that true science and true faith have no real ground of quarrel.

In the ten chapters that compose the work, among the scientific topics slightly touched or more fully handled are the antiquity of man, which is too slightly discussed; the geological and Mosaic cosmogónies, in which he adopts the demiurgic day theory; and development and Darwinism, in which he arrays Agassiz against Darwin. There is, thus far, little that is *new* to those who have kept tolerably posted on these subjects; and even since the author wrote, the phases of these topics have been advancing. Next, the spiritual nature of the soul is discussed, largely from the physiological stand-point, and is illustrated with a body of interesting facts and principles. The succeeding chapter on the Doctrine of the Mediator is fresh, from his stand-point, but evades the central question—how far a satisfaction of one man's sin by another man's suffering is reconcilable with our intuitive sense of absolute justice. Does not the same intuitive sense that requires penalty at all require that the doer of the sin, solely, should be the sufferer of the penalty? In the chapter on the Faith-faculty in Man, or, as we perhaps would call it, the intuition of the supernatural, he opens up some fresh, consistent, and, as we believe, true views on man's susceptibility to communication from the invisible, from both good and evil natures. From this starting-point we have very suggestive views on inspiration, oracles, divination, magic, possession, necromancy, and modern spiritism. This is a valuable, timely, but too brief, chapter. The closing, and perhaps the best, chapter is on The Resurrection. We have first a short running sketch of the history of the doctrine, in which it appears beyond question that the reanimation of the body that dies is, and ever has been, the doctrine of the universal Church; opposed, especially, by the over-spiritualistic Gnostic heresy, but seldom questioned by any author or party of undisputed orthodoxy in the Church. He reviews some of the theories touching the body to be raised. The rabbis solved the difficulty by supposing that there was an indestructible bone in the body called *Luz*, which was the key-stone of the new body; but modern anatomy has never been able to discover this incombustible vertebra in the human skeleton. On this important point our author adduces a new and decisive physiological fact which will, we think, hereafter take a permanent place in the defense of the Scripture doctrine of the Resurrection. We quote his words:

> Much of the matter connected with our bodies during life is doubtless foreign, and not essential to their identity. Nine tenths of the human body consists of water—as has been shown by the weight of a corpse which had been desiccated in an oven—and of the remaining tenth part much is material in a state of decay, having been used by the vital processes, and now effete, or being cast off. So that but a very small proportion of the matter of our bodies can really be said to be our own.
>
> We have seen that of the total amount of material associated with our bodies, physiology shows a very small part only to be essential to their integrity.[*] That matter only which is in a nascent condition, or which is being applied to vital use, can be said to belong to our bodies. Supposing this small part to be indestructible, many of the objections to a resurrection drawn from the nourishment of other organized bodies will be removed, for both animals and vegetables are built up from the decomposition of other beings.—Pp. 258–260.

When the foreign elements are thus eliminated, and the true body remains alone, it is thereby reduced to one tenth of its apparent magnitude. But a still further reduction ensues, we may add, from the abolition of the alimentary and generative parts of the earthly human system, as both reason and the New Testament suggest. But while the material particles of the body are thus unchanged, and become the substance of the new body, the organism passes through a reorganizing and glorifying "change." The same in material, it is new in arrangements, properties, and capabilities. If we desire to know what these newnesses are, the sacred text gives us significant hints when we are told that there will be a "spiritual body," and that that body will be angel-like.

By the body's becoming a "spiritual body" we understand that it will be so subtilized, so adjusted to the pure spirit, and so subjected in every part and particle to the volition and power of the spirit, that while the spirit becomes, so to speak, more substantiated, the personal unit of the two natures possesses all the capabilities that our thought usually attributes to the pure spirit. By volition it passes with lightning rapidity through nameless distance. It clairvoyantly sees, at volition, through a finite immensity. By volition it transforms itself to any shape, and invests itself with a countless variety of properties and phenomenal presentations It can become as the dark rolling cloud, the flashing lightning, the solid rock. And yet it will have a normal figure and face, which will at once be the true expression of its essential nature, (far more truly than human physiognomy now manifests the character,) and will reveal to the intuition of the

---

[*] Dr. Beale, a most eminent English authority in histology: says: "Some years ago I obtained evidence which convinced me that the substance of the bodies of all things living was composed of matter in two states; and I showed that the truly vital phenomena, *nutrition*, *growth*, and *multiplication*, were manifested by one of the two kinds of matter, while the other was the seat of physical and chemical changes only. From observation I was led to conclude that, of any living thing but a part of the matter of which it was constituted was really *living* at any moment. In the case of adult forms of the higher animals and man, indeed, only a very small portion of the total quantity of their body-matter is alive at any period of existence."—*Life-Theories: their Influence upon Religious Thought. By Lionel S. Beale, M.D., F.R.S, etc.*

fellow-celestials the particular personality and perhaps the entire past history of the individual. When asked, Will the glorified bodies have teeth? we reply, If they please; and eat with them, too, as the angels did who visited Abraham. If asked, Will they have hair? we reply, Yes, if they please; and "shining raiment," too, as the two angels did before the apostles at the ascension. Nothing is more clear, we think, than that varying phenomenal form and properties are more or less at the command both of the pure spirit, and of the unit of spirit and spiritual body.

When the spirit stands before the judgment-seat of Christ re-invested with a fresh material body, whence comes the matter that forms its frame? From some part or parts of the wide creation, it is agreed, the particles come, and by divine power gather in form around the soul. And now, we ask, *Why may they not be the very particles* which formed the dying body, just *as well as any other particles?* If the former, it is a true resurrection; if the latter, it is not a resurrection but a new creation. Dr. Wythe well suggests that there may be a real affinity between the soul and *its* particles, by which they are attracted. The soul may be a magnet to its own bodily elements. Bishop Butler has finely shown that the resurrection, though supernatural to our own earthly system, may be *natural* within a wider system. The law by which the corporeity returns to its soul may belong to a more comprehensive system of laws, which, like a broader circle, incloses the lesser circle in which we are placed. If we could only have, not a little narrow, Huxleyan earthy science, but the broad science that could take in the laws of the vast universe, which are truly the volitions of God, we should see that the soul re-invests itself with the drapery of its former body by as real laws, and under as genuine a science, as the first organism itself was shaped by the wonderful "plastic power."

The World before the Deluge. By LOUIS FIGUIER. Newly Edited and Revised by H. W. BRESTOW, F.R.S. With 235 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 518. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

The To-Morrow of Death; or, The Future Life according to Science. By LOUIS FIGUIER. Translated from the French by S. R. CROCKER. 12mo., pp. [illegible] Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1872.

The first of the above two volumes is geology, arrayed in picturesque diction, and adorned with an abundance of pictorial illustrations. It is a reduced, though not abridged, edition of a work of much larger size and more sumptuous style, and is thereby suited for a more extensive circulation. Though deferential to the Old Testament, and often quoting its text as illustration, it is

dorses the geologic man without any attempt to find him in Genesis, and furnishes a picture of his person and family connections, his cave-home and his quadruped neighbors in social contiguity, sketched with as much confidence as if Brady had been on the spot to photograph the entire group. He gives the ordinary set of geologic arguments to authenticate man's contemporaneity with extinct species. He scouts Darwinism, however, and recognizes a divine Creator.

In the second work Figuier constructs for us a new religion according to modern science. All existing religions are good, and to be spoken of with sacred reverence; for they all include worship, and worship is a purifying, elevating, developing exercise for the soul. Materialism, on the contrary, is degrading, and morally destructive. Yet all existing religions, being formed in ages of ignorance, embrace fundamental errors which science will in the course of the twentieth century dissipate. In an eloquent apostrophe, therefore, he bids all the religions of the earth go to their respective temples and worship according to their own rites, under the cheerful assurance that in due time the ascendency of science will bring them all to the same true and holy dogma. The following is a brief statement of *his* religion.

The minutest amœba has the primary germinal soul, which at death, dropping its body, transmigrates into an individual of the next higher species of being; and this dying, the soul again ascends a grade higher, until it has passed through all the gradations of animal life up to man, forgetting in each stage its history in its preceding stage. All souls are hereby immortal, brute as well as human. By a sort of intellectual Darwinism souls graduate from the lowest to the highest species. Behold, then, fully explained, the mystery, purpose, and intrinsic nature of the ascending grades of animal races! The whole is a grand process by which souls are brought up to the summit platform of humanity. But what of man's soul?

Science discloses that immensity of space is not vacant, but is perfectly filled with a pure ether, subtler than thought can conceive. The soul of man at death drops its earthly body forever and graduates into this ether, which is itself the blissful paradise of the pure spirit. Yet the spiritualization is not always complete; for the souls of the wicked, weighed down with corruptions, fall back to earth, and are condemned to be re-incarnated in a new body. Behold, says the author, a rich improvement upon "the hell of Christianity." The soul, at this first attempt, loses paradise; but it is permitted to try again and again, until at last it shall succeed.

dorses the geologic man without any attempt to find him in Genesis, and furnishes a picture of his person and family connections, his cave-home and his quadruped neighbors in social contiguity, sketched with as much confidence as if Brady had been on the spot to photograph the entire group. He gives the ordinary set of geologic arguments to authenticate man's contemporaneity with extinct species. He scouts Darwinism, however, and recognizes a divine Creator.

In the second work Figuier constructs for us a new religion according to modern science. All existing religions are good, and to be spoken of with sacred reverence; for they all include worship, and worship is a purifying, elevating, developing exercise for the soul. Materialism, on the contrary, is degrading, and morally destructive. Yet all existing religions, being formed in ages of ignorance, embrace fundamental errors which science will in the course of the twentieth century dissipate. In an eloquent apostrophe, therefore, he bids all the religions of the earth go to their respective temples and worship according to their own rites, under the cheerful assurance that in due time the ascendency of science will bring them all to the same true and holy dogma. The following is a brief statement of *his* religion.

The minutest amœba has the primary germinal soul, which at death, dropping its body, transmigrates into an individual of the next higher species of being; and this dying, the soul again ascends a grade higher, until it has passed through all the gradations of animal life up to man, forgetting in each stage its history in its preceding stage. All souls are hereby immortal, brute as well as human. By a sort of intellectual Darwinism souls graduate from the lowest to the highest species. Behold, then, fully explained, the mystery, purpose, and intrinsic nature of the ascending grades of animal races! The whole is a grand process by which souls are brought up to the summit platform of humanity. But what of man's soul?

Science discloses that immensity of space is not vacant, but is perfectly filled with a pure ether, subtler than thought can conceive. The soul of man at death drops its earthly body forever and graduates into this ether, which is itself the blissful paradise of the pure spirit. Yet the spiritualization is not always complete; for the souls of the wicked, weighed down with corruptions, fall back to earth, and are condemned to be re-incarnated in a new body. Behold, says the author, a rich improvement upon "the hell of Christianity." The soul, at this first attempt, loses paradise; but it is permitted to try again and again, until at last it shall ascend

Here is a doctrine of retribution at once most merciful and just. Let us all be good, and avoid these disastrous failures.

The human soul at its re-incarnation forgets its past history, yet retains traces of its existence. Our innate ideas, or special propensities, our marked shapes of character, are mostly the results of our previous life. Besides, most of us have moments in which we seem to recollect to have been in a similar scene in a previous state of existence.* None of us know how many human lives we have lived, or how many times we have fallen from the blessed Eden. Let us, therefore, take warning and courage, and try by perfect purity of life to soar to and through the pure ether.

These exalted human ethereals will nevertheless die; that is, they will fling off the dim vestiges of earthliness, and emerge to the *central heaven*, which is *in the sun*. The sun is a great globe of subtle fluid, into which the perfectly blessed souls of the finally saved are gathered. In fact, it is the spiritual, life-giving emanations from the aggregate of these blessed solar souls which give to the solar rays their vivifying power in earth, by which souls germinate and graduate. Thus the circle of vital activity is fully formed through earth, ether, and sun back to earth again, and will endure forever. Nevertheless, to our own view, it is difficult, we confess, to see how this circle first commenced. The aggregate of solar souls is a necessary antecedent to the first starting of earthly life; and the start of earthly life is a necessary antecedent to the existence of the solar souls. The circle, therefore, seems a logically "vicious circle." Moreover, it seems impossible that this circle should last forever. Would not the time at last come that the aggregate of solar souls would fill the whole solar system, and so, as politicians say, "demolish the ring?"

It will at once be seen that this is a magnifical religious air-castle. It can be called "according to science" merely because it incorporates some of the facts of science into its structure. It is purely hypothetical and imaginary, without scientific logic or basis; yet we admire the amiable, serious, and reverent spirit of the author. We agree with him that most religions are better than no religion, and that materialism and atheism are the basest dregs and lowest sediment of the moral world.

---

* Draper, in his Physiology, refers to this fact, and endeavors to explain it from the doubleness of the structure of the human brain. It is a fact of our own individual life that we had repeatedly experienced this reflex consciousness before we had ever heard of its occurrence in others. On mentioning it to the late Dr. Wilbur Fisk we were surprised, and, indeed, relieved, to learn that it was no symptom of craze in our case, but an experience of his own and of most others.

The Complete Phonographer. By JAMES E. MUNSON, Official Stenographer to the Surrogate's Court, New York.

Phonography is to a considerable degree an occult science, and the practice of it a measurably mysterious art. It has superseded all other forms of short-hand, and has been quite extensively adopted by courts of law for making records of testimony, charges, and for many other purposes. Hence stability is of the first importance. The phonographer has become a sworn officer in many courts, and he has solemnly bound himself to make a record which can be read by others as well as by himself. There can be no justification for introducing new "notions" not legible to others instructed in the form of the art, which has had now for thirty years or more an accepted general feature and signification. Every new work, and especially those exhibiting innovations, must undergo the most searching criticism; for the great concerns referred to above, which are in its keeping, are watched with the jealous eyes of moneyed interests.

The work before us makes the most extravagant and confusing changes in the established system—such as to render it proper to deny its claim to be called *phonography.* It is more properly a sort of weak and insufficient *short-hand.* The author is a "stenographer," and seems to be conscious of making the most serious mischief wherever his notions may be introduced; though, of course, he assumes to have imperative reasons, which, as far as they appear to us, are invalid. He refers several times in his preface and elsewhere to the necessity of a justification for what he has done, as if he were haunted by the ghosts of the time-honored phonographic and short-hand principles he has massacred. Of course his contradictions are frequent and his inconsistencies various, after the manner of most misdoers. Some of his changes may be indicated without short-hand types. They are, 1. Employing on the alphabet strokes two initial hooks of different size to represent L, where before only one size was used, namely, a large hook on curved strokes, and a small hook on straight strokes. 2. Employing the inverted dot-vowel scale, contrary to thirty years' phonographic practice, and opposed to the order of nature, as shown by Professor Willis by means of a telescopic-tubed organ pipe. 3. Discarding dashes and ticks, the quickest, most easily formed, and, consequently, the most legible of all the short-hand signs except the dots. 4. Claiming to teach only one style of writing; namely, the reporting only—no easy style for those who do not wish to learn reporting. He assigns a false reason for doing so; but before he finishes the page he

furnishes proof of its falsity. 5. Violating analogy and other short-hand principles in representing H by a heavy sign, slow to make, when that sound is one of the slightest and shortest of utterances.

His first aim, he says, has been "to restore simplicity and harmony as far as possible by adhering to general principles and discarding all unnecessary expedients." He speaks of "returning" to something phonographic, as if what he proposes were once in the system. Out of these six destructive so-called restorations not one was ever in the system, not even the topsy-turvy vowel scale. Not one of them is a "returning" to any thing, nor "restoring" any thing in phonography. These expressions are deceptive, purposely introduced to cover innovations not to be tolerated. The title of the book is misleading, (1) Because his work is not "complete," not even for those desiring to learn reporting. In his first paragraph he is apologetic for the absence of the foundation of phonography, namely, a treatise on phonetics, falsely claiming that one is not needed, because its principles are, he says, in a sort of general way sufficiently understood. (2) It has no instruction upon reporting upon the following subjects: namely, astronomy, geology, mineralogy, antiquities, medicine, physiology, criticism, *belles-lettres*, politics, etc. (3) It is deluding because it claims to be inductive, a charge which the author confirms by his directions to the learner on page sixteen.

A system of short-hand adapted to our very irregular language must have some irregularities, or it must sacrifice much in speed and legibility. Several hundred systems of short-hand demonstrate this. It is not true, as he claims it is, that a few hundred exceptions throw doubt over every word in the language; even the exceptions do not occasion doubt.

He claims an advantage for the inverted vowel scale which any one can refute who has counted 10,000 words to ascertain the gains and losses by its use. The truth will be found not to vary materially from the following statement. In that scale 630 of them are slightly easier to vocalize; 900 are more difficult: 142 now exceptionally placed would be regularly in the first position; while 1,363 would be out of position. Leaving out of the reckoning the 142 words which would be legitimated, the advantages are 630, and the disadvantages are 2,263.

The work under review contains some of the worst plagiarisms known in the art, as may be seen in the Student's Journal, where Mr. Graham is exposing its piracies. Some of the most valuable features of the logical analysis in Mr. Graham's book are apfurnishes proof of its falsity. 6. Violating analogy and other short-hand principles in representing H by a heavy sign, slow to make, when that sound is one of the slightest and shortest of utterances.

His first aim, he says, has been "to restore simplicity and harmony as far as possible by adhering to general principles and discarding all unnecessary expedients." He speaks of "returning" to something phonographic, as if what he proposes were once in the system. Out of these six destructive so-called restorations not one was ever in the system, not even the topsy-turvy vowel scale. Not one of them is a "returning" to any thing, nor "restoring" any thing to phonography. These expressions are deceptive, purposely introduced to cover innovations not to be tolerated. The title of the book is misleading, (1) Because his work is not "complete," not even for those desiring to learn reporting. In his first paragraph he is apologetic for the absence of the *foundation* of phonography, namely, a treatise on phonetics, falsely claiming that one is not needed, because its principles are, he says, *in a sort of general way* sufficiently understood. (2) It has no instruction upon reporting upon the following subjects: namely, astronomy, geology, theology, antiquities, medicine, physiology, criticism, *belles-lettres*, politics, etc. (3) It is deluding because it claims to be inductive, a charge which the author confirms by his directions to the learner on page sixteen.

A system of short-hand adapted to our very irregular language must have some irregularities, or it must sacrifice much in speed and legibility. Several hundred systems of short-hand demonstrate this. It is not true, as he claims it is, that a few hundred exceptions throw doubt over every word in the language; even the exceptions do not occasion doubt.

He claims an advantage for the inverted vowel scale which any one can refute who has counted 10,000 words to ascertain the gains and losses by its use. The truth will be found not to vary materially from the following statement. In that scale 830 of them are slightly easier to vocalize; 900 are more difficult; 142 now exceptionally placed would be regularly in the first position; while 1,363 would be out of position. Leaving out of the reckoning the 142 words which would be legitimated, the advantages are 830, and the disadvantages are 2,263.

The work under review contains some of the worst plagiarisms known in the art, as may be seen in the Student's Journal, where Mr. Graham is exposing its piracies. Some of the most valuable features of the logical analysis in Mr. Graham's book are appropriated. Although the writer makes a parade of crediting others, for trifles even, he does not so much as once credit Mr. Graham. He appropriates the mode of exhibiting the principles; also the way of introducing reading and writing exercises, and many important features of contractions and expedients, as will appear in both word and manner in his "special contractions;" also in "vocalized and unvocalized" styles; also in the arrangement of certain lists formerly grouped under S, now copied after Graham; also in the nomenclature, which, by its halting plagiarism, is very imperfect. L.

More Criticisms on Darwin and Administrative Nihilism. By T. H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. 12mo., pp. 85. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

One of Mr. Huxley's most pitiable performances. It is not indeed like his Protoplasm, a Waterloo disaster, but in its petty details of malignity, sophistry, and blasphemy it compels the dismission of all moral respect for the man in any right-minded reader. The opening statement in the pamphlet is a reversal of the truth. He asserts that "a happy change has come over Mr. Darwin's critics;" he was on the first publication of his work assailed with "a mixture of ignorance and insolence;" now it seems he is treated more learnedly and more deferentially. The truth is, and we speak from clear recollection, Mr. Darwin's book was immediately answered in nearly every great Quarterly of England, not with "insolence," but with respect; not with "ignorance," but with a learning and logic that remain to this day unrefuted. The change if any has been adverse. His theory is still theory, and not science. Its popularity we believe to be waning; the answers are becoming increasingly conclusive, and Mr. Darwin himself has made very important retractions. And as Mr. Darwin has gradually shown the moral effect of his own theory on his own mind, so the moral condemnation of moderate men like Lord Ormathwaite has become more articulate. Both Darwin and Huxley, as time advances, are palpably becoming more and more demoralized.

The Appletons have inserted in the advertisement pages of the present pamphlet the following passage, quoted from the "Independent:"

> There are those who hold the name of Professor Huxley as synonymous with irreverence and atheism. Plato's was so held, and Galileo's, and Descartes's, and Newton's, and Faraday's. There can be no greater mistake. No man has greater reverence for the Bible than Huxley. No one more acquaintance with the text of Scripture.

Now we never heard that the five illustrious men here named were charged with atheism. But with what justice irreverence toward the Bible may be imputed to Mr. Huxley let the following passages show:

> *Huxley's Reverence for the Decalogue.*—When, Sunday after Sunday, men who profess to be our instructors in righteousness read out the statement, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is," in innumerable churches, they are either propagating what they may easily know, and, therefore, are bound to know, to be falsities; or, if they use the words in some non-natural sense, they fall below the moral standard of the much-abused Jesuit. —P. 24.
>
> *His Reverence for the Text of Genesis.*—Catholic theology, like all theologies which are based upon the assumption of the truth of the account of the origin of things given in the book of Genesis, being utterly irreconcilable with the doctrine of evolution, the student of science, who is satisfied that the evidence upon which the doctrine of evolution rests is incomparably stronger and better than that upon which the supposed authority of the book of Genesis rests, will not trouble himself further with these theologies.—P. 25.
>
> *His Reverence for the Bible History of Creation.*— . . . an insult to ask an evolutionist whether he credits the preposterous fable respecting the fabrication of woman to which Suarez pins his faith.
>
> *Ribaldry*—If he [the evolutionist] have the courage to stand alone face to face with the abyss of the eternal and unknowable, let him be content . . . in the sure faith that the hell of honest men will, to him, be more endurable than a paradise full of angelic shams.—P. 27.

There are other passages which read to us like the grossest materialism sustained by the most idiotic sophistry, and others that sound like a contemptuous atheism. But it would require more space than we can spare to expose and expound them. On his own ground of science he may be a respected authority; but when he approaches subjects higher than science, Thomas Huxley is a name quite below Thomas Paine.

The pitiable figure which scientists like Huxley have of late so plentifully exhibited when they overleap the boundaries within which they are really great, and strut out as dictators in metaphysics and theology, is becoming disgusting to the wiser heads of their own body. Dr. Carpenter, though, perhaps, not quite faultless on this point himself, in his late address, as President, before the British Association, uttered these wise words:

> But when science, passing beyond its own limits, assumes to take the place of theology and sets up its own conception of the order of nature as a sufficient account of its cause, it is invading a province of thought to which it has no claim, and not unreasonably provokes the hostility of those who ought to be its best friends. For, while the deep-seated instincts of humanity and the profoundest researches of philosophy alike point to mind as the one and only source of power, it is the prerogative of science to demonstrate the unity of the power which is operating through the limitless extent and variety of the universe, and to trace its continuity through the vast series of ages that have been occupied in its evolution.

Lectures on the Science of Religion. With a Paper on Buddhist Nihilism, and a Translation of the Dhammapada, or "Path of Virtue." By MAX MULLER, M. A. 12mo., pp. 300. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

The Lectures on the Science of Religion are four in number, in which the author prosecutes his plan of finding, by comparative theology, the absolute faculty of religion in man. Christianity is the only religion, unless Buddhism be an exception, which may dare to challenge a comparison with all other systems. The result will show in Christianity the absolute religion; yet the Christianity of Muller will be a Christianity divested of what the great body of the Church has considered inseparable if not essential parts. He rejects the idea of an historical primitive revelation, and believes that the true primitive religion must be found in man's nature after all traditional errors have been eliminated. The religious sentiment among all peoples has invested itself with myths of which it must be divested in order to be rightly interpreted. We suppose he would allow that the purest theism is enveloped in the myths of Genesis. He would doubtless recognize something superhuman and divine in Christ.

The greatest religious problem of the world is Buddhism. It is said that, while it upholds a morality nearly as pure as Christianity, it is yet a stupendous system of Atheism, and the heaven it promises to its devotees is—Annihilation. Over these last two facts the Atheist Büchner triumphs, as utter disproofs of the notion that God and immortality are intuitions of the human soul. When, however, it is said that Buddhism is atheistic, it is not meant that it teaches no supernatural; on the contrary, it teaches a vast range of supernaturalism for man; but over that stupendous range it knows no supreme, intelligent Controller. But our own theism does not claim that human intuitions, in all stages of mental development, affirm so perfect an idea of God. We should only maintain, that such is the nature of the human mind in our human sphere that the supernatural is almost, if not quite, universally suggested to the human mind; and when the human mind is developed, through the course of a valid reasoning, it attains to the complete idea of God. It is in the first of these two stages that the Buddhist peoples have rested. So the intuition of *Number* is innate in the human soul; for all there may be tribes that cannot count four, and other peoples that have been arrested at certain stages of numerical development, yet every healthy human mind can be carried through a genuine process of true development, by which it becomes master of all the complexities and wonders of Arithmetic. Whether the Nirvana promised the Buddhist was

Lectures on the Science of Religion. With a Paper on Buddhist Nihilism, and a Translation of the Dhammapada, or "Path of Virtue." By MAX MULLER, M. A. 12mo., pp. 300. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.

The Lectures on the Science of Religion are four in number, in which the author prosecutes his plan of finding, by comparative theology, the absolute faculty of religion in man. Christianity is the only religion, unless Boddhism be an exception, which may dare to challenge a comparison with all other systems. The result will show in Christianity the absolute religion; yet the Christianity of *Muller* will be a Christianity divested of what the great body of the Church has considered inseparable if not essential parts. He rejects the idea of an historical primitive revelation, and believes that the true primitive religion must be found in man's nature after all traditional errors have been eliminated. The religious sentiment among all peoples has invested itself with myths of which it must be divested in order to be rightly interpreted. We suppose he would allow that the purest theism is enveloped in the myths of Genesis. He would doubtless recognise something superhuman and *divine in Christ.*

The greatest religious problem of the world is Boddhism. It is said that, while it upholds a morality nearly as pure as Christianity, it is yet a stupendous system of *Atheism*, and the heaven it promises to its devotees is—*Annihilation*. Over these last two facts the Atheist Buchner triumphs, as utter disproofs of the notion that God and immortality are intuitions of the human soul. When, however, it is said that Buddhism is atheistic, it is not meant that it teaches no supernatural; on the contrary, it teaches a vast range of supernaturalism for man; but over that stupendous range it knows no supreme, intelligent Controller. But our own theism does not claim that human intuitions, in all stages of mental development, affirm so perfect an idea of God. We should only maintain, that such is the nature of the human mind in our human sphere that the supernatural is almost, if not quite, universally suggested to the human mind; and *when* the human mind is developed, through the course of a valid reasoning, it attains to the complete idea of God. It is in the first of these two stages that the Buddhist peoples have rested. So the intuition of *Number* is innate in the human soul; for all there may be tribes that cannot count four, and other peoples that have been arrested at certain stages of numerical development, yet every healthy human mind can be carried through a genuine process of true development, by which it becomes master of all the complexities and wonders of Arithmetic. Whether the *Nirvana* promised the Buddhist was absolute annihilation or a state of ineffable quietude, is an open question. In the essay in this volume on that subject, Max Muller declares for the latter. Yet nothing herein avails to disprove the sentiment of man for immortality. The doctrine of Buddhism evidently is, not that annihilation is preferable to happy existence, or to existence in itself, but to such existence as it recognizes in the actual lot of all human beings. In short, the Buddhist theory seems to be this: Existence, such as it actually is through all the universe, is a bad job; the best thing, therefore, is to take the straitest path out of it; and that is through justice, purity, and perfect passionlessness. But the intuition of immortality does not affirm that perpetuated existence in misery is preferable to annihilation. Some of our thinkers have indeed lately maintained that proposition; but we think that there might be degrees of misery, without hope of release, inflicted on any man, such as to overcome his love of existence, and make him ready to plunge into nothingness. That disproves not the natural love of existence or the natural instinct for immortality; it only proves that there may be other feelings so strong as to counterbalance it. We do not see, therefore, that on either of these two points Büchner and atheism have any cause to rejoice.

A good authority for such a view, the *Nation*, says, that the difference between Christianity and Buddhism is, that the former is the religion of hope, the latter of despair. One would suppose that the contrast might insure the triumph of the former. Christianity teaches that our life is past under the control of a supreme goodness; that the present life may be happy life; that the future may be an eternity of active bliss.

◆

Creator and Creation; or, The Knowledge in the Reason of God and his Work. By LAURENS P. HICKOK, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 360. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Herbert Spencer has furnished us a theory of the Universe in the interests of Atheism; Dr. Hickok now offers a Theory which is in the interests of Theism. The former, beginning with matter and its properties, attains nothing in the direction of a Creator, but an Unknown Absolute with neither intelligence nor ethic; the latter begins with the Absolute Reason as truly known to human Reason, and thence overspreads and animates science with a divine philosophy. Our Intuitions, styled by him *the Reason*, are fully authorized to read a true and exalted faith into the facts of Experience. The neglect or abjuration of the laws of the Rea-

son he holds to be the source of the infidelity of Science, and if truly and consistently carried out destroys science itself.

The work is divided into Two Parts, the former demonstrating through our highest and surest faculties the existence, personality, and trinality of the Absolute Reason, and the latter unfolding the Creation as being, in the light of our human Reason, the veritable work of the Absolute Reason.

The key to Dr. Hickok's cosmical philosophy is the assumption that *Matter is solidified Force.* Thereby he professes to relieve the Act of creation from that inconceivability on which Atheism bases itself. He evades all contradiction of the maxim "*From nothing, nothing.*" When a man throws a stone he *puts forth force;* and so God *puts forth force.* And as the force put forth is not God himself, so this doctrine does not identify matter with God and is not Pantheism.

Assuming the primal Reason as furnishing the Force and the Idea of the structural Universe, Dr. Hickok requires but three sorts of forces to frame its entire mechanical system. These are the Antagonistic, the Diremptive, and the Revolving. Antagonistic forces coming into collision deadlock each other and form solid substance. Substance is thus fixed and space-filling force. Upon this lump of "frozen force," called matter, an additional rush of force in any one direction produces motion. Diremptive (or repellent?) force produces the ether, and evolves all the phenomena of heat, light, etc. Resolving Forces produce all the planetary and other astronomical phenomena.

Yet thus far the universe is a dead mechanism. Descending from the astronomic system to the surface of our own planet, the author encounters and unfolds the mysteries of the phenomena of Life. He traces the ascending grades of modification in the terraces of the life system. Assimilation, organization, sexualization in ascending series, are at the basis. Unconscious life, guided by an unthinking instinct, deduces the vegetable system from the mineral, in subserviency to a next superior realm, the animal. Sense reigns in the animal system, enabling the brute to reason, judge, and act within its low domain. But in man the pure intuitive Reason, the power that beholds by direct gaze the infinite, the ethical, the axiomatic, the universal, is superimposed as the crowning endowment. Here is in man the image of God, the stamp of immortality.

How does the author *prove* his system? He simply propounds and expounds it, and leaves it to the rational judgment of the

reader. The validity of the theory depends upon its own consistency in itself as a whole, and upon the completeness with which it interprets the facts of science to the reason. It is, then, a marriage between science and a Christian philosophy. It proposes to meet Spencer, Tyndal, Huxley, and Mauderly (without once naming them) with a systematic solution of the puzzles with which their science would invalidate the fundamentals of faith. It does this by interpolating the dictates of the intuitive philosophy into the facts of experience. The whole is written in Dr. Hickok's philosophical verbiage, with a rich roll of sonorous periods requiring elaborate study, which, we doubt not, it will amply reward, provided the student can perforate the thick shell of the author's nomenclature.

Astronomy and Geology Compared. By LORD ORMATHWAITE. 16mo., pp. 159. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

The author, a retired parliamentary statesman, suffering under blindness, dictated these pages to an amanuensis. They are the sound, sometimes profound, reflections of a most thoughtful man on the proposed theories of the origin of our race. He contrasts the demonstrative character of astronomical reasoning with the uncertainties of geology. He opposes the Darwinian theory both as unscientific and atheistic. He quotes Darwin's rejection of a higher power "analogous to though superior to that of human reason," as apparently implying atheism. Darwin's expression reminds us of a definition of God attributed by a Southern paper to Carl Schurz: "That imaginary gentleman above the clouds." Lord Ormathwaite's work is well worth perusal for its depth and suggestiveness. We give the following grave difficulty for Darwinism:

> The propagation of the species is the consequence of sexual connection, which requires an elaborate adaptation of the male and female organs to each other. Now how, in the first instance, could this division into the two sexes have been effected by Natural Selection? Did it occur in the parent stock, and was it handed down through the successive varieties, or was Natural Selection to effect it again in each particular case? Supposing that the first was a single being, how was the division into the two sexes effected? Could Natural Selection do this? for in order that the male and female should be fitted for their respective parts, a very elaborate adaptation of their bodily organs would become necessary; but they must be furnished with these at once in order to fulfill the purposes for which they were made, and nature could not afford to stand still for several generations while Natural Selection was perfecting them, even if it could possibly perfect them at all.
>
> The instinct which by the process of sexual connection sets in motion the whole machinery by which life in its different forms is renewed and perpetuated, is among the strongest in the economy of nature. How it could spring from Natural Selection alone is beyond my comprehension; but it is also to be noted that it is not only implanted in the vast majority of living beings, comprising all

reader. The validity of the theory depends upon its own consistency in itself as a whole, and upon the completeness with which it interprets the facts of science to the reason. It is, then, a marriage between science and a Christian philosophy. It proposes to meet Spencer, Tyndal, Huxley, and Maudsley (without once naming them) with a systematic solution of the puzzles with which their science would invalidate the fundamentals of faith. It does this by interpolating the dictates of the intuitive philosophy into the facts of experience. The whole is written in Dr. Hickok's philosophical verbiage, with a rich roll of sonorous periods requiring elaborate study, which, we doubt not, it will amply reward, provided the student can perforate the thick shell of the author's nomenclature.

Astronomy and Geology Compared. By LORD ORMATHWAITE. 16mo., pp. 173. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

The author, a retired parliamentary statesman, suffering under blindness, dictated these pages to an amanuensis. They are the sound, sometimes profound, reflections of a most thoughtful man on the proposed theories of the origin of our race. He contrasts the demonstrative character of astronomical reasoning with the uncertainties of geology. He opposes the Darwinian theory both as unscientific and atheistic. He quotes Darwin's rejection of a higher power "analogous to though superior to that of human reason," as apparently implying atheism. Darwin's expression reminds us of a definition of God attributed by a Southern paper to Carl Schurz: "That imaginary gentleman above the clouds." Lord Ormathwaite's work is well worth perusal for its depth and suggestiveness. We give the following grave difficulty for Darwinism:

> The propagation of the species is the consequence of sexual connection, which requires an elaborate adaptation of the male and female organs to each other. Now how, in the first instance, could this division into the two sexes have been effected by Natural Selection? Did it occur in the parent stock, and was it handed down through the successive varieties, or was Natural Selection to effect it again in each particular case? Supposing that the type was a single being, how was the division into the two sexes effected? Could Natural Selection do this? for in order that the male and female should be fitted for their respective parts, a very elaborate adaptation of their bodily organs would become necessary; but they must be furnished with these at once in order to fulfil the purposes for which they were made, and nature could not afford to stand still for several generations while Natural Selection was perfecting them, even if it could possibly perfect them at all.
>
> The manner in which by the process of sexual connection this is effected, the whole machinery by which life in its different forms is renewed and perpetuated, is among the strangest in the economy of nature. How it could spring from Natural Selection alone is beyond my comprehension; but it is also to be noted that it is not only implanted in the vast majority of living beings, comprising all

those raised above the very lowest types, but that it is regulated by certain laws. This instinct operates through a desire attracting the two sexes to each other. How is it that this appetite is always confined within its proper limits, and is never found in animals (in a savage state, at least) to lead them to deviate from them? If the sexual instinct were to be widely diffused, a sort of chaos in animal life would be created. . . . In a state of nature this law is absolute; in a state of domestication some irregularity appears, chiefly caused by the subagency of man interrupting to a certain extent the course of nature. But here another law steps in protecting the different races of living beings from that confusion which would result if such power had been left unrestricted. Some of the domestic animals, of different though very similar organizations, are found, under the direction of man, to be capable of sexual intercourse and of bringing forth an offspring; but here steps in another law of nature, a sort of second safeguard or barrier erected against the indefinite multitude of species: the issue of these connections is always barren. Does not this argue foresight in the great Lawgiver? How could Natural Selection alone create such prospective limitation?—Pp. 83–85.

The Great Industries of the United States. Being an Historical Summary of the Origin, Growth, and Perfection of the Chief Industrial Arts of this Country. By HORACE GREELEY, LEON CASE, EDWARD HOWLAND, JOHN B. GOUGH, PHILIP RIPLEY, F. B. PERKINS, J. B. LYMAN, ALBERT BRISBANE, Rev. E. E. HALL, and other Writers upon Political and Social Economy, Mechanics, Manufactures, etc., etc. With over 450 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 1,304. Hartford: J. B. Burr & Hyde. Chicago and Cincinnati: J. B. Burr, Hyde, & Co. 1872.

This volume presents a magnificent picture of the manifold civilization which our country has attained. The copious title is all the book notice our space allows, save the assurance to the reader that the volume fills out the programme.

The Science of Elocution: With Exercises and Selections systematically arranged for easily acquiring the Art of Speaking. By S. S. HAMILL, A.M., Professor of English Literature and Elocution, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. 12mo., pp. 388. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872.

Professor Hamill may be remembered among the few who stand at the head of his profession as an elocutionist and teacher of that beautiful art. His work is a very clear analytical treatment of the elements of the science, with an abundance of drill exercises, ingeniously constructed, for training the voice, and attaining first a distinct articulation, and then the higher graces and forces of expression. Then follows a series of extracts from the best authors and orators, as exercises in declamation. The volume is a masterpiece in the art, and its external finish is attractive.

Few men are so perfectly completed by nature for orators as not to need some of the aids of art. Most public speakers find it important to attain the advantages that skillful criticism can afford. And, even in private life, such are the habits of rapid and indistinct utterance in our Northern States, that there are scarce any who do not need some training in a clear, full, articulate style of colloquial utterance. On the other hand, a well

attained clearness of utterance is a desirable attainment; and even as a graceful art, with no purpose of practical oratory, a skill in elocution is an accomplishment. The present volume may be recommended as without a superior, to our scholars, to our ministry, and to our academic, collegiate, and theological classes.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Life of Abraham Lincoln from his Birth to his Inauguration as President. By WARD H. LAMON. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 547. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872.

This volume is the solid result of an immense amount of research into the facts of Mr. Lincoln's life, comprised in many volumes of manuscript matter derived from the recollections of his friends, relatives, school-mates, professional associates, and especially from the accumulated memoranda of his law-partner, Mr. Herndon, of Springfield. For contemporaneity and ultimate thoroughness of research perhaps no history was ever more perfectly authentic. Mr. Lamon disclaims all other merit in the execution of the work than *conscientiousness;* and though we cannot accord with some of his pronounced judgments, we do recognize a profound, not to say *relentless*, adherence to truth in his work.

No disguises or colorings are flung over the facts that Mr. Lincoln's parentage was not only humble, but utterly *mean;* that his childhood grew in dirt and rags on the earth floor of a miserable cabin; that as he grew amid demoralization and ignorance, he was the athletic match of the best bully of those parts; and that he was profane, obscene, and an irreligious scoffer. Early grown to six feet high and a surplus, his articles of apparel were four—*videlicet*, an old straw hat without a band, a calico shirt, a pair of tow trousers reaching slightly below the knee, and a pair of tan-colored brogans. BUT it is a long lane that has no angle. The boy, however slight his schooling, was early a voracious borrower and reader of books, and he soon began to write lampoons, and other exercises of native wit. Discovering one day that English grammar was a necessary aid to acceptable writing or speaking, he forthwith strode a half dozen miles to obtain that mysterious book. His muscular superiority he used, not only in repressing bullies, but in securing the triumph of magnanimity, reconciliation, and peace. Good-nature, jocularity, generosity, and story-telling, made him a popular favorite.

Next after the grammar he aspired to a law book, to pettifogging

in a justice's court, to the Legislature. His natural logic and elocution unfolded themselves. His depth of feeling, his strong moral nature, his profound sympathy with the popular heart, made him eloquent. He began to attain moments of popular power over an audience that even a Patrick Henry would not have undervalued. A seat in Congress first brought him into the broad arena of national politics. Then came the great moral movement of the age—*the slavery question!* While his attachment to the Constitution and history of his country rendered him cautious and conservative, his deep moral nature enabled him to lead the progress of public opinion in his section. It was only in efforts where he took the high place of "ETERNAL RIGHT," as Mr. Herndon assures us, that he towered to his greatest height of oratory. Wonderful, nevertheless, was the skill with which he played between the absolute truth and the capacity of his hearers to receive the truth. By that rare skill, united with the fact that he had the great moral progressive side, his victory over the able and unprincipled Stephen A. Douglas, in one of the most remarkable series of contests on record, was complete. And when the decisive moment came for his nomination to the Presidency, such was his powerful hold on the masses, who saw their own apotheosis in his elevation, such the masterly ability with which he had managed the Republican cause in his section, that the great and then untarnished name of William H. Seward ceased to be an invincible spell.

The episode on Mr. Lincoln's history as a lawyer forms one of the most interesting chapters in the work. In striking illustration of his deep moral nature was his total incapacity for defending the immoral side, or a dishonest client. He dared not plead such cases from the fact that he could not conceal his feeling of the wrong, and so escape convicting his own client. When convinced that he had a wicked case, he would surrender it to his brother counsel and refuse the fee. One of the best things in the book is the story of his actually deserting a bad client and running out of the court-house. When sent for to the hotel by the judge, he replied, "Tell the judge I cannot come; *my hands are dirty, and I must wash them.*" The result of such a method would naturally be that a jury would, of course, presume that a case was all right if managed by "honest old Abe."

Mr. Lamon has expended a chapter in showing and over-showing that Mr. Lincoln was no orthodox Christian. He brings evidence to his being an atheist, and distinctly maintains that he seldom referred to a Deity in his speeches, and then with no real

meaning. Mr. Lamon's honesty in making so gross a mis-statement is clearly evinced by his furnishing in his own pages the ample refutation. Our authority in contradiction to Mr. Lamon is Mr. Lincoln himself.*

Taking, then, Mr. Lincoln's own public language as conclusive, we have found, *first*, no evidence that he recognized a Redeemer, and but a single instance in which he speaks with respect of "Christianity;" and, *second*, plenty of evidence that he was a reverent theist, and in moments of high moral excitement he rose to what might be called a *pious theism.* It was the deep expression of this last feeling which attracted the sympathies of the Christian public, and produced the unconscious trust that he was essentially a Christian. It was a generous and liberal mistake, and deserves a better appreciation than men of the Herndon and Lamon stamp have the heart to concede. Of course, the reverse tone of feeling on the part of the Christian community would have been berated as "bigotry," "pious malevolence," etc. Religion can never suit the hearts of men whose hearts she cannot set right.

If Mr. Lincoln's most solemn utterances are to be trusted he was no atheist, no pantheist, no fatalist, no believer in his own being over-ruled by blind natural causes. He believed in a living personal God, the just judge of human guilt, the gracious guardian heretofore of our past history, the merciful hearer of prayer, who will yield his benign protection to those who reverently implore it. His asking the prayers of the Springfield assembly is unparalleled in the entire record of Presidential addresses. Its deep, earnest pathos touched thousands of Christian hearts throughout the North. Nor could Mr. Lincoln or Mr. Lamon be unaware to what class of men such an appeal is, with

---

* After Mr. Lincoln's election he made a parting speech at Springfield, and several more on his way to Washington. His successive professions of faith, here as elsewhere, are conclusive against all other evidence yet furnished.

At Springfield: "I go to assume a task more difficult than that which devolved on Washington. Unless the great God, who assisted him, shall be with and aid me, I must fail; but if the same omniscient mind and Almighty arm, that directed and protected him, shall guide and support me, I shall not fail—I shall succeed. Let us all pray that the God of our fathers may not forsake us now. To him I commend you all. Permit me to ask that, with equal sincerity and faith, you invoke his wisdom and guidance."

At Columbus: "I judge that all we want is time and patience, and a reliance on that God who has never forsaken his people."

Before the Legislature of New York: "I still have confidence that the Almighty Ruler of the Universe, through the instrumentality of this great and intelligent people, can and will bring us through this difficulty, as he has heretofore brought us through all preceding difficulties of the country."

any reality, to be made. Who are the people to whom prayer—not the mere sentimental impulse of an excited moment, but genuine prayer, the conscious intercourse with the Divine—is not a strange work? Whose are the hearts which are earnestly nigh to God—from which fervent prayer spontaneously upward flows? Are they the Pantheists, Deists, Parkerites, Unitarians, or worldlings? No, no, no! Mr. Lamon well knows that it is not to such quarters that the heart in distress goes for the protection of prayer or for aid in learning how to pray. Mr. Lincoln's appeal, then, to possess any reality, was to the poor patronized or insulted Evangelicals: the solemn Puritans or the fervent Methodists. It is with the very class alone whose creed he derides that effectual prayer lives. And this, we aver, is a unique demonstration, as well as an unconscious confession, that with these is not only the true Christianity, but *the true* ABSOLUTE RELIGION. Religion is communion and access with God, and these are identical with effectual living prayer; and the world well knows that the very center of this power of prayer is with the fervent believer in the atonement through the sacrificial blood of a divine Redeemer. Let our rationalistic and worldly friends, who scorn these "dogmas," never forget that, nevertheless, here is the central sanctuary, to which even their own hearts must turn when craving for effectual prayer. If ever Mr. Lincoln attained to a true Christianity it was by this route. It was solemn responsibilities that made him devout, and his moral and spiritual nature rose as they increased. Great trials may have brought him nigh to God. Not to us belongs the province of pronouncing upon him a final judgment.

Notwithstanding many unfortunate turns of expression, Mr Lamon is not to be held as turning Mr. Lincoln's unbelief into a slur upon Christianity. On the contrary, very full and explicitly, (page 504,) he describes it as the sin and misfortune of Mr. Lincoln's life, the result of his demoralized associations in earlier years, and the negative source of a large share of his mental misery. But Mr. Lincoln's own words in regard to God and a gracious divine government, on numerous occasions, are too solemn and explicit to allow the belief that they were insincere.

Mr. Lamon somewhat patronizingly indicates what is his own as well as Mr. Lincoln's opinion of the clergy. What their opinion was or is is of much less importance to the clergy than to themselves. A man's opinion of the clergy is much more a test indirectly of his own character than of theirs. The Protestant ministry of these United States may, for learning, ability, true

dignity of character, purity, earnest fidelity, and hard-working benevolence, challenge comparison with any body of men equally numerous that ever existed. As a learned and talented profession, they may safely challenge comparison with any other profession. In these respects the American pulpit need not bow to the American bar or the American Congress. If we are to count star names, our pulpit galaxy need not pale. If learning is the test, its scholarship, exhibited in our colleges, theological seminaries, Quarterlies, and standard publications, shrinks from no comparison. No body of men exists in whose favor a larger balance of indebtedness for unpaid services is due from the world. Mr. Lamon graciously assures us that Mr. Lincoln had a good opinion of the clergy, "clerical politicians" alone excepted. Now we, as a churchman and a minister, may reasonably object to a "clerical politician," because we believe the ministry to be a sacred institution. But how had Mr. Lincoln any such right, to whom the ministry was no specialty? Lincoln accepted all other good politicians without looking back of the man to his occupation. To a lawyer politician, a merchant politician, a rum-seller politician, a cobbler or tinker politician, he made no objection. With what propriety of logic, then, could he except to a good, able, unimpeachable "clerical politician," because he belonged to the purest profession of men extant? We know clergymen of clear, logical, practical minds, intimately versed in our political history, who if they could be induced to become politicians or statesmen would be not "the worst politicians in the world," but the best. *We* have a *right* to object to their going into politics; Mr. Lincoln had none. And here we may note that Mr. Lamon's dragging in that impertinent digression in regard to Rev. Dr. Gulliver (pronounced by the Bibliotheca to be untrue) bears intuitive traces of personal malignity, and is an outrage, reflecting only upon its author.

Yet we thank Mr. Lamon for even the unflinching details of Mr. Lincoln's life. There is nothing in their realistic coarseness to prevent Lincoln from becoming to the eyes of the suffering millions of all the world what he, even already, is—an ideality, a symbol, a parable that auspicates their own ennoblement. Upon the image of his sad, wan face, millions of eyes still gaze with the irrestrainable tear. This first volume closes, like a romance, at the summit of life; the next will close, like a tragedy, with a catastrophe. We shall look to the second with interest, assured that many mysteries of Mr. Lincoln's presidential career will be unrolled with unshrinking hand. Mr. Lamon is "a chiel amang

them takin' notes," and woe to the "coats," and petticoats too, that have "holes" in them.

Autobiography of Amos Kendall. Edited by his Son-in-law, WILLIAM STICKNEY. 8vo., pp. 700. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

This portly volume, though read with interest, does not succeed in placing us among the admirers of Amos Kendall. That gentleman was son of a New Hampshire deacon, graduated at Dartmouth in 1807, went to Kentucky and became private tutor in the family of Henry Clay, subsequently joined the Jackson party, and finally attained so high a post as Postmaster-General under Jackson.

The history of our country scarcely presents a purer statesman through his entire life than John Quincy Adams; yet it was a sad and demoralizing spectacle set before the nation when first that brilliant patriot, Henry Clay, really made him President, and he forthwith turned round and made Henry Clay Secretary of State. We have no belief that any verbal bargain was previously made, or that any mutual understanding was in any way exchanged between them. But there stood in open day the great national facts. These two men had reciprocally placed each other in the two highest offices of the Government. What aggravated the matter was that the Secretary of State had, heretofore, been a sort of Prince of Wales, an heir apparent to the Presidency; so that these two noble men did most unequivocally make each other President and prospective President. That single patent fact rendered them deserving the upset they received.

What rendered the crime greatest of all was that it enabled a flock of greedy political cormorants, calling itself the Democratic Party, to raise the sham banner of "Reform," and, under the lead of a tall semi-civilized south-western bravo, General Jackson, to seize the Government and overwhelm it with a corruption from which it has never recovered. The "Hurrah for Jackson," started by the Mississippi boatmen and rolled through the country, was the first "hurrah" ever known in our politics. The degradation of our politics then commenced with an immediate completeness. Both parties learned these methods of success, and hurrah and rowdyism have ever since been prevalent and controlling elements on both sides.

Of the inroad of this Vandal occupancy Mr. Kendall was a somewhat efficient instrument. That he acted conscientiously is no part of our business to dispute; but we think history, so far as she notices him, will view him as acting badly. In his office of Postmaster General he was the pliant agent of power. Our antislavery history has a severe charge to lay to his account. Co-ordinate

with many unconstitutional stretches of power, which the party of "strict construction" (?) were ever ready to perpetrate to any extent on behalf of the slave-power, Mr. Kendall, against all law and decency, expelled abolition matter from the public mails. It is unfortunate for Mr. Kendall's memory that this flagrant act is about the only transaction of his life sufficiently salient to attract the eye of history. The future, alas! may know him only as the official violator of the public mails at the beck of the vilest system of despotism that ever saw the sun. Kindly biography, however, here affirms that in private life he was in every way excellent. He was immersed into the Baptist Church at the age of seventy-six, and died in that religious faith in 1869. The volume abounds in narrations and portraitures illustrative of our national history and progress for the last fifty years, and will be read with interest by all parties.

The Desert of the Exodus. Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wanderings; undertaken in connection with the Ordinance Survey of Sinai and the Palestine Exploration Fund. By E. H. PALMER, M.A., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Maps and numerous Illustrations from Photographs and Drawings, taken on the spot by the Sinai Survey Expedition, and C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake. 12mo., pp. 470. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Thoroughly prepared by a knowledge of the Arabic language and a mastery of the extant biblical literature connected with the subject, Mr. Palmer, traveling on foot, has made a leisurely survey of the localities of the Wilderness Sojourn of Israel, which much advances, if it does not complete, the work done by explorers like Stanley and Robinson. The results are in a high degree satisfactory, both in illustration and confirmation of the Mosaic history. The cuts and maps give a clear light to the narrative; the maps, finely executed and colored, are very acceptable to the biblical scholar. The work has already been wrought into notes in the Speaker's Commentary.

Mr. Palmer is a very entertaining narrator. His volume is full of cheery humor, graphic description, with portraitures and anecdotes illustrative of the present population and general condition of the regions he describes.

Literature and Fiction.

Lucretius on the Nature of Things. Translated into English Verse by CHARLES FREDERICK JOHNSON. With Introduction and Notes. 12mo., pp. 333. New York: De Witt C. Lent & Co. 1872.

A Lucretius in readable English is an admirable "Tract for the Times." It reveals to many conceited prattlers about "modern with many unconstitutional stretches of power, which the party of "strict construction" (!) were ever ready to perpetrate to any extent on behalf of the slave-power. Mr. Kendall, against all law and decency, expelled abolition matter from the public mails. It is unfortunate for Mr. Kendall's memory that this flagrant act is about the only transaction of his life sufficiently salient to attract the eye of history. The future, alas! may know him only as the official violator of the public mails at the beck of the vilest system of despotism that ever saw the sun. Kindly biography, however, here affirms that in private life he was in every way excellent. He was immersed into the Baptist Church at the age of seventy-six, and died in that religious faith in 1869. The volume abounds in narrations and portraitures illustrative of our national history and progress for the last fifty years, and will be read with interest by all parties.

The Desert of the Exodus. Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wanderings; undertaken in connection with the Ordnance Survey of Sinai and the Palestine Exploration Fund. By E. H. PALMER, M.A., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Maps and numerous Illustrations from Photographs and Drawings, taken on the spot by the Sinai Survey Expedition and C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake. 12mo., pp. 470. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Thoroughly prepared by a knowledge of the Arabic language and a mastery of the extant biblical literature connected with the subject, Mr. Palmer, traveling on foot, has made a leisurely survey of the localities of the Wilderness Sojourn of Israel, which much advances, if it does not complete, the work done by explorers like Stanley and Robinson. The results are in a high degree satisfactory, both in illustration and confirmation of the Mosaic history. The cuts and maps give a clear light to the narrative; the maps, finely executed and colored, are very acceptable to the biblical scholar. The work has already been wrought into notes in the Speaker's Commentary.

Mr. Palmer is a very entertaining narrator. His volume is full of cheery humor, graphic description, with portraitures and anecdotes illustrative of the present population and general condition of the regions he describes.

Literature and Fiction.

Lucretius on the Nature of Things. Translated into English Verse by CHARLES FREDERICK JOHNSON. With Introduction and Notes. 12mo., pp. [illegible]. New York: De Witt C. Lent & Co. 1872.

A Lucretius in readable English is an admirable "Tract for the Times." It reveals to many conceited prattlers about "modern thought," "advanced thinking," "latest conceptions," "emancipation from old traditions," etc., etc., that they are not half so original as they had in blissful ignorance imagined themselves, and that they are the traditional heirs of atheistic speculations older than the Christianity that once drove them out of existence. We apprehend that a comparison will show that, with the exception of the illustrations drawn from the science of the present day, there is little in Tyndall's showing of the possibility of a spontaneous evolving of a cosmos into being which cannot be found in Lucretius's atheistic processes; and nothing in Buchner's argument for the perishability of the soul, excepting its fierce blatancy, which Lucretius has not anticipated by two thousand years. This is, indeed, no answer to their arguments, but a check upon their conceit, and a fair silencer of the stereotype vocabulary in which their conceit expresses itself.

It is, indeed, a conflict of ages—this battle between (as Cudworth calls them) "the physiologers" and the theologers—between matter, annihilation, and eternal laws on the óne hand, and soul, immortality, and God on the other. Arguments of wonderful force can be brought upon each side; the wavering contest has been waged through millenniums, and it may be said that each man's conclusions will largely depend upon the *temper*, the heart assumptions, the will, with which he begins and prosecutes his processes. Voluntary denial can maintain its logical ground and stay in atheism; voluntary faith can find ample grounds for her unfaltering trust in immortality in God. All the nobler intuitions of the soul are for faith. It is the divine in man that testifies Divinity. In full alliance it is with these that Christianity comes in, and upon the basis of our previous reason superadds the "full assurance of faith." The true final demonstration of God comes alone of that communion with God, bestowed on self-consecrating faith, which sweetly allays all doubt, and reveals, with a certainty not belonging to mere mysticism, the reality of a divine Presence. This gracious reward is attained by man as the result of the right exercise of his highest powers and divinest nature, and is the earnest of the final union of the human with the Divine.

How minutely faithful Mr. Johnson's translation is, not having made close comparison, we cannot say; but no doubt the English reader will get a competent view of the Lucretian argument. Of the poetic merits of the version we cannot speak with enthusiasm. The rhythm is often violated and the measure at

fault. The introduction furnishes very suggestive views in regard to the great arguments of the work. The recognition of the nobleness apparent in the character of Lucretius, and the apology for his great error, drawn from the polytheism it was intended to abolish, we fully indorse. It is well shown how the poet's recognition of the supremacy of Law working out an intelligible cosmos, really involves a wise Omnipotence over all. This does not clear the poet of atheism, but merely shows how atheism must overreach itself. It might have been more fully shown that atheism, denying as it does our noblest intuitions, has no right to avail itself of any of our intuitions. Professing to deny every evidence but sense, it has no right, when its argument demands, to soar out of sense. It has no right to any axioms or any sense-transcending ideas. It has no right to use the words Eternal, Infinite, Space; no right to the axiom, *From nothing nothing always comes.* Not even can the conception of Law, much more Eternal Law, the atheistic substitute for God, come from sense.

Miscellaneous.

The Old Curiosity Shop. By CHARLES DICKENS. Illustrated by Thomas Worth. 8vo., pp. 233. Green and gilt. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Little Folk for Life. By GAIL HAMILTON. 24mo., pp. 219. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Michael Faraday. 24mo., pp. 223. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

A beautiful portraiture in miniature, for the people, of the great Christian scientist.

Shall an American Sabbath be a Holyday or a Holiday. Sermon Preached in the Spring Garden Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. C. H. PAYNE. 8vo., pp. 14. Philadelphia: Inquirer Book and Job Print. 1872.

An eloquent contribution to the cause of the sacredness of our American Sabbath.

New Red Boxes of Sunday-School Literature issued from our Book Rooms are:

Books for the Children's Hour. Embracing The Wood Carvers, Alice Leigh's Mission, Real Robinson Crusoes, A Home Tour with Aunt Bessie, Little Grig and the Tinker's Letter.

Little Blue Mantle Library. Embracing eleven beautiful booklets in red and gilt.

Sunberry Dale Library. Five volumes in the box.

Silverbeach Library. Embracing Silverbeach, Rachel Cardingford's Book, Laying the Keel, The Junior Clerk.

Notices of the following books are postponed to the next number:

Day's Science of Æsthetics. Chatfield & Co.

Dr. Brunson's Memoirs. Hitchcock & Walden.

Dr. Jacoby's (German) *History of Methodism.*

fault. The introduction furnishes very suggestive views in regard to the great arguments of the work. The recognition of the nobleness apparent in the character of Lucretius, and the apology for his great error, drawn from the polytheism it was intended to abolish, we fully indorse. It is well shown how the poet's recognition of the supremacy of Law working out an intelligible cosmos, really involves a wise Omnipotence over all. This does not clear the poet of atheism, but merely shows how atheism must overreach itself. It might have been more fully shown that atheism, denying as it does our noblest intuitions, has no right to avail itself of any of our intuitions. Professing to deny every evidence but sense, it has no right, when its argument demands, to soar out of sense. It has no right to any axioms or any sense-transcending ideas. It has no right to use the words Eternal, Infinite, Space; no right to the axiom, *From nothing nothing always comes.* Not even can the conception of Law, much more Eternal Law, the atheistic substitute for God, come from sense.

Miscellaneous.

The Old Curiosity Shop. By Charles Dickens. Illustrated by Thomas Worth. 8vo., pp. 183. Green and gilt. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Little Folk Life. By Gail Hamilton. 24mo., pp. 219. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

Michael Faraday. 16mo., pp. 123. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

A beautiful portraiture in miniature, for the people, of the great Christian scientist.

Shall our American Sabbath be a Holiday or a Holyday. Sermon Preached in the Spring Garden Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. C. H. Payne. 8vo., pp. 14. Philadelphia: Inquirer Book and Job Print. 1873.

An eloquent contribution to the cause of the sacredness of our American Sabbath.

New Red Boxes of Sunday-School Literature issued from our Book Rooms are:

Books for the Children's Hour. Embracing The Wood Carvers, Alice Leigh's Mission, Reed Robinson Crusoe, A Home Year with Aunt Bessie, Little Guy and the Tinker's Letter.

Little Star Bessie Library. Embracing eleven beautiful booklets in red and gilt.

Sunberry Dale Library. Five volumes in the box.

Silverbrook Library. Embracing Silverbrook, Rachel Cardingford's Book, Loyal to the Last, The Junior Clerk.

Notices of the following books are postponed to the next number:

Ray's Science of Salvation. Chatfield & Co.
Dr. Brunson's Memoirs. Hitchcock & Walden.
Dr. Jacoby's (German) History of Methodism.

INDEX.

Abbott: Laicus, etc.................. Page 532
—— Light 356
—— The August Stories.............. 180, 356
—— Water and Land........................ 356
Adams: New Treatise upon Regeneration in Baptism.................................. 508
Address to the ministers of the M. E. Church in New England by convention of ministers and members, held in Boston, April, 1839, to consider the expediency of establishing a Methodist Theol. Institution.... 246
American Baptist Home Mission Society, report of....................................... 268
—— Church Review 306
—— Congregational Union, report of....... 268
—— Presbyterian Review..................... 127
Apocalypse a Dramatic Allegory, The....... 54
  Church addressed—Model Church symbolized....................................... 55
  Actual Church portrayed 56
  Interest God and angels take in the Church 56
  Penal judgments on idolatrous nations... 62
  Prophecy of Old and New Covenant fulfilled....................................... 65
  Threefold forces arrayed against the Church 67
  Resurrection—Judgment—final glorious state of the saints. 74

Bahr: The Book of Kings..................... 532
Baldwin: Ancient America in Notes on American Archæology........................ 523
Baptist Quarterly............ 127, 306, 490, 641
Barker: Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces.................................. 5, 414
Bascom: Æsthetics.............................. 356
Beale: Protoplasm, etc......................... 414
—— The Mystery of Life........... 5, 159, 414
Beecher: Sermons of............................ 677
—— The Life of Jesus the Christ.......... 154
—— Yale Lectures on Preaching.......... 677
Bennett: Memorials of Methodism in Virginia....................................... 348
Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review.. 131
Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic, 127, 307, 490, 641
Birthplace of Jesus and Chronology of his Infancy, The.................................. 216
  Proof that Christ was born in Bethlehem. 216
  Different narratives of Christ's infancy harmonized.................................. 218
  Visit of the Wise Men........................ 219
  Flight into Egypt, etc......................... 223
  Chronological synopsis of evangelical history up to return from Egypt.......... 225
Blyden, Lewis, & Dwight: People of Africa. 168
Books for the Children's Hour.. 700
Books published by John Dickins, etc..... 40
Boston Theol. Seminary, Annual Reports of. 246
British and Foreign Evangelical Review, 131, 491
British Quarterly Review.... 131, 307, 491, 650
Brown: First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth.. 355
—— Misread Passages of Scripture......... 155
Büchner: Force and Matter............... 5, 414
Butler: The Land of the Veda............. 170

Cartwright, Peter, and Preaching in the West.......................... Page 556
  State of society............................. .. 560
  John Wesley..................................... 564
  Preachers sent out by Wesley 566
  Organization of Methodist Church....... 567
  Introduction of Methodism into America and Western Emigration two contemporary facts............ 570
  Francis Asbury—M'Kendree.......... 571, 573
Chamberlayne: Saving Faith; its Rationale. 155
Christian Pastorate, The......................... 587
  Review of Dr. Kidder's work............... 588
  General introduction.......................... 589
  The ministerial call............................ 590
  Local preachers—supernumeraries... 593, 595
  Pastoral work—public worship........... 597
  Ardent spirits—tobacco, etc............... 599
Christian Quarterly.................... 127, 641
Christian Theology and Modern Skepticism. 521
Church Erection Fund of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, Report of.................... 268
Church Extension................................. 268
  Among British Wesleyans.................. 271
  Among Presbyterians........................ 276
  Among Congregationalists 278
  Among the Baptists.......................... 279
  Methodist Episcopal Church—Historical *résumé* 281
  Organization and plans..................... 287
  General fund—Loan fund............ 290, 291
Church Extension Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Report.................... 268
Clark: Supply and Qualifications for the Ministry 246
Cobden: The Turning Wheel.................. 180
Cocker: Christianity and Greek Philosophy 442
Collyer: The Life that Now Is.............. 676
Conservation, Correlation, and Origin of the Physical, Vital, and Mental Forces... 5, 414
  Definition of.................................... 6
  Physical force the source..................... 9
  Opinions of various writers................ 10
  Various forms of physical or chemical force capable of mutual conversion.......... 12
  Definition of terms:
    1. Conservation; 2. Correlation; 3. Evolution; 4. Force..................... 14, 15, 16
  Terms force and motion not to be confused. 19
  Unification of force and matter........... 21
  Evidence upon which a correlation of forces is affirmed, examined............ 24
  Facts 25
  No living organism yet produced from dead matter................................... 415
  Combining agent—assertions and imaginings 428, 431
  Spencer reviewed............................... 435
Cooke: The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version........................ 388
Cowles: The Revelation of John............ 152
Crosby: Compendious Greek Grammar.... 180

Deems: Jesus.................................... 516

De Lanoye: Rameses the Great..... Page 355
De Puy: Threescore Years and Beyond. 355, 531
Dewey: Life and Letters of Catherine M. Sedgwick. 180
Dickens: The Adventures of Oliver Twist. 356
—— The Old Curiosity Shop.................. 700
Drew Theol. Sem., Address at the Opening. 246
Dryden: Suggestive Inquiries concerning the Resurrection of the Dead, as taught in the New Testament.......................... 667
Dunn: The Mission of the Spirit........... 677
Dwight: People of Africa.................... 168

Edinburgh Review................ 313, 495, 650
Ellis: Melville Family and their Bible Readings 180
Ewald: The History of Israel.............. 345
Examination of Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.................... 836

Faraday, Michael. 700
Fetridge: Rise and Fall of the Paris Commune in 1871................................ 356
Fields: Yesterdays with Authors......... 356
Figuier: The To-morrow of Death......... 680
—— The World before the Deluge......... 680
Fontaine: How the World was Peopled... 521
Foreign Literary Intelligence:
  Germany.................... 149, 334, 506, 664
  Italy.......................................335, 506
Foreign Religious Intelligence. 145, 326, 503, 660
  Eastern Churches.......................... 328
  France.. 660
  Germany...................................... 503
  Protestantism............................... 326
  Roman Catholicism............... 145, 332, 503
Foster, J. O.: Life and Labors of Mrs. M. N. Van Cott.. 355
Foster, R. S.: Treatise of the Need of the M. E. Church with respect to her Ministry 246
Froude: Short Studies on Great Subjects .. 355
Future Condition of the Wicked? What is the 546
  Meaning of *Gehenna*, *Sheol*, and *Hades*.. 547
  The wicked will be a distinct class........ 550
  Will be punished 550
  Their condition of untold suffering....... 551
  Changeless condition—eternal punishment 552
  Meaning of Greek word *Aionion*........... 553

Gardiner: Diatessaron; The Life of Our Lord, etc.. 180
Gavarret: *Les Phénomènes Physique de la vie*... 5, 414
General Conference Journal, Educational Reports and Documents in 246
General Conference, Work for the Coming.. 295
  Measures pertaining to women 296
  —— literature.............................. 298
  —— itinerancy.............................. 302
  —— property................................ 306
German Explorations in Africa.............. 77
  The explorers, Barth, Vogel, Overweg, Rohlfs, and Nachtigall...................... 77
  European colonization of Northern Africa 78
  The Prussian Embassy to Bornou....... 87
  A proposed German India in the heart of Africa.. 91
  A commercial route from Tripoli to the heart of Africa.............................. 93
Gregory: The Thorough Business Man.... 180
Grove and Others: Correlation and Conservation of Forces; a Series of Expositions. 414

Hamill: Science of Elocution. 691
Hamilton, Gail: Little Folk for Life....... 700
—— Woman's Worth and Worthlessness... 356
Hannah 180
Harrison: The Old Back Room............. 180
Hart: First Lessons in Composition. P. 356, 531
—— Manual of Composition, etc. 355, 531
—— Manual of English Literature..... 356, 531
Haven: Incidents and Anecdotes of Rev. T. Taylor.. 528
Haweis: Music and Morals 355
Hayes: The Land of Desolation............ 356
Heck Hall, Evanston, Address at Dedication 346
Hickok: Creator and Creation, etc........ 685
Higher Educational Institutions of New England, The.......................... 181, 399
  New England theological schools among the earliest in this country.............. 181
  College statistics in 1830, 1850, and 1870.. 182
  Yale, Brown, and Dartmouth. 183
  The Vermont colleges........................ 184
  Williams and Amherst....................... 184
  Maine and Connecticut colleges.......... 185
  Students per year in Wesleyan University for forty years.......................... 186
  Students from out of New England in New England colleges.. 187
  Classification of students from N. England 188
  Religious denominations and the colleges in New England 188
  Decline of collegiate education there..... 190
  Increase of population—increase of the foreign-born inhabitants considered.... 192
  Tabular statistics of scientific departments 399
  Religious condition........................ 402
  Theological institutions.................. 403
  Methodist academies...................... 405
Hinton: Man and his Dwelling-place...... 513
Hodge: Systematic Theology.............. 337
Homer and his English Translators.... 357, 619
  His chief attraction........................ 358
  Johann Heinrich Voss...................... 359
  John Ogilby—Thomas Hobbes...... 363, 365
  Alexander Pope............................. 369
  Fenton and Broome......................... 371
  William Cowper............................. 378
  W. Sotheby—W. Munford—Baxter...... 379
  Defects of the earlier translations........ 619
  Lord Derby's translation.................. 620
  Bryant's translation........................ 624
  Partial comparison between the two last. 625
  Mr. Bryant's Odyssey...................... 632
Hovey: God With Us, etc.................. 673
Huggins: Spectrum Analysis.............. 356
Hughey: Political Romanism.............. 515
Huntington: The Church Idea............. 518
Huxley: Half Hours with Modern Scientists 356
—— Lay Sermons, Addresses, Reviews.. 5, 414
—— More Criticisms on Darwin and Administrative Nihilism.............................. 685

Industries of the United States, The great.. 691
Is God Cognizable by Reason?............. 442
  Analysis of Dr. Cocker's work........... 442
  The idea of God general.................. 446
  A priori demonstration—Arguments *posteriori*.. 447
  Argument from consciousness........... 448
  Atheistic theories—Greek philosophy. 448, 449
  Argument from common consent......... 459
  Direct revelation—immediate intuition.. 461
  Ætiological argument..................... 462
  Homological and Ontological argument.. 465

Johnson: Lucretius on Nature of Things. 356, 698

Kellogg: The Cruise of the Casco......... 180
Kidder: The Christian Pastorate........... 587
Kingsley: At Last; a Christmas in the West Indies.. 354

Lamon: Life of Abraham Lincoln, from his Birth to his Inauguration as President... 692
Lange: Commentary on the Holy Scriptures 519
Lewis: People of Africa..................... 168

Liberia, the Republic of; its Status and its Field.............................. Page 466
Inauguration of colonization.............. 467
American Anti-slavery Society........... 469
Liberia colonized.......................... 475
Becomes a republic—its growth..... 477, 479
Adjacent Tribes.......................... 482
Religion of Western Africa.............. 487
Little Blue Mantle Library.................. 700
Little Sunshine's Holiday.................. 356
Lockyer: Spectrum Analysis................ 356
London Quarterly Review.... 132, 318, 491, 650
—— (New York: Reprint)... 138, 307, 497, 650

M'Cabe, L. D.: Light on the Pathway of Holiness.......................... 355, 520
M'Causland: The Builders of Babel........ 526
M'Clintock & Strong: Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.......................... 355, 517
M'Cosh: Intuitions of the Mind Inductively Investigated....... 165
M'Donald: Annihilation of the Wicked Scripturally considered.................. 355
M'Donald, Geo.: Wilfred Cumbermede.... 356
M'Donald: Spiritualism Identical with Ancient Sorcery.......................... 355
M'Rae: Lectures on Satan.................. 180
M'Vickar: Life of John M'Vickar, S.T.D... 170
Manning: Half Truths and the Truth....... 342
Marcy: Border Reminiscences............. 180
Margolwuth: Poetry of the Hebrew Pentateuch....................... 355
Martin: Origin and History of the New Testament.............................. 180
Maudsley: Body and Mind.............. 5, 414
May: Aunt Madge's Story.................. 180
Mercersburg Review.................. 307, 490
Methodist Book Concern and its Literature. 40
First catalogue............................ 40
Church history—biography.................. 43
Apologetic and controversial.............. 43
Commentaries—travel—biblical literature and criticism—denominational polity—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—holiness 44
Modern and popular works................ 45
Periodical literature..................... 46
Sunday-school and Tract department..... 47
Early history of the Book Concern....... 50
Methodist Book Concern, List of Publications.................................... 40
Methodist Episcopal Church in the Southern States, The....................... 103
Organization of M. E. Church, South..... 104
Change of status by the late war........ 104
Necessity of Northern Church aid....... 105
Response of M. E. Church............... 107
Extent and growth of new work......... 107
That work not injurious to M. E. Church, South.............................. 109
Outlay—labor—fruit. 111
Benevolent collections.................. 114
Other missionary work.................. 115
Border Conferences—enlargement........ 117
Statistics of the nineteen Southern Conferences........... 119
Conclusions submitted.................... 121
Methodist Episcopal Church, The organization of the 194
No form of Church organization prescribed in Scripture.......................... 194
Different forms may be equally valid.... 195
Right to organize a new Church inheres in every body of Christians............. 195
Had American Methodists, in 1784, the right to organize as a Church?.......... 197
Had those who acted in the organization a right to do so?....................... 200
Was their work of doubtful validity?.... 202
Methodist Episcopal Church:
Does election without ordination constitute a man a Bishop?............ Page 207
Episcopacy in the English Church........ 211
Election and consecration required in the M. E. Church...................... .. 212
Classes and orders....................... 213
Metropolitan Chapel Building Fund, London 268
Miller: Christianity and Modern Thought.. 518
Ministerial Education in our Church....... 246
The M. E. Church a great theol. seminary. 247
Principles of our Meth. Church system:
1. Training of Ministers should be in hands of the Church...................... 248
2. None except those divinely called to be trained............................ 250
3. Theoretical and practical training to be combined........................ 251
The early training system changed a generation since............................ 253
"Conference course of study"............ 255
Effective board of ministerial instruction needed.............................. 256
Objections to theol. seminaries considered 258
Necessary re-adjustment of deranged system.................................... 261
Ministerial Education, Two Systems of..... 94
The Romish system........................ 95
In contrast to that of Protestant State-Ch. 95
Papal system excels, 1. In attaching students to the Church...................... 96
2. In control over students' studies.... 97
3. In provision for molding the future man. 98
4. In qualifying candidate for his profession 99
The Protestant State-Church excels, 1. In developing self-reliance; 2. In breadth of general culture...................... 101
3. In specific theological education..... 102
Moffatt: A Comparative History of Religion 520
Morris: Dogs and their Doings............ 180
Muller: Lectures on the Science of Religion, etc.................................. 687
Munson: The Complete Phonographer. 355, 688
Murphy: Habit and Intelligence, in connection with the Laws of Matter and Force. 5, 414
Murray: Sermons by. Park-street Pulpit.. 180

Nadal: Educational Qualifications for the Ministry................................ 246
Neill: Memoir of Rev. Patrick Copeland.. 180
New Englander............................ 127
New England Historical and Genealogical Register................................. 127
Nine Letters on Ministerial Education..... 246
North American Review.......... 127, 307, 490
Nott, Dr.: The Resurrection of Christ..... 675

Ormathwaite: Astronomy and Geology compared... 690
Owen: The Debatable Land between this World and the Next....................... 162

Paine: Physiology of the Soul and Instinct, as distinguished from Materialism....... 339
Palmer: The Desert of the Exodus........ 698
Payne: Shall an American Sabbath be a Holyday or a Holiday?.................... 700
Perry: Defense of the Present Mode of Training Candidates for the Ministry of the M. E. Church.......................... 246
Pittsburgh Christian Advocate *versus* Our Methodist Episcopacy, The............... 170
Presb. Quarterly and Princeton Review. 307, 490
Pressense: Early Years of Christianity—Martyrs and Apologists 169
Pressense's Jesus Christ; his Life and Work 155
—— Martyrs and Apologists................ 538
Pressense as a writer..................... 534

Pressensé's Martyrs and Apologists.
  Different forms of persecution...... Page 535
  Enthusiasm for martyrdom.............. 538
  Post-apostolic fathers and apologists..... 539
  Survey of the attack and defense of Christianity in the domain of controversy... 543
Prevention and Reform of Juvenile Crime. 601
  Opinion of Dr. Channing.............. 603
  Origin and progress of Francke's Orphan-House in Halle.............. 605
  Early life and work of John Falk........ 605
  Reformatory institutions in Europe...... 607
  Societies formed.............. 608
  Opening of House of Refuge, New York. 608
  Other Houses of Reform.............. 611
  Need of well-arranged and remunerative work.............. 615
Proposed New Articles of Religion......... 229
  Our articles, except the twenty-third, abridged from the Church of England.. 229
  Reasons for additional articles given...... 230
  List of new articles designated.......... 235
Protoplasm; or, Life, Matter, and Mind... 5

Quarterly Book-Table......... 152, 336, 508, 667
Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.............. 127, 307, 491, 641

Reclus (transl. by Woodward): The Earth.. 163
Redford: History of Methodism in Kentucky 165
Rhode Island Convention. Report of first... 245
Richmond: New York and its Institutions. 530
Rolfe: Shakspeare's History of King Henry VIII.............. 356
Roscoe: Spectrum Analysis.............. 356
Rothe: Richard.............. 381
  Birth and early studies.............. 382
  Embraces Pietism.............. 383
  Marriage—becomes a preacher.......... 384
  Takes a professor's chair.............. 385
  Becomes an author.............. 385
  His earnest religious character.......... 386
  His preaching.............. 391
  His works—his theology............ 392, 393

Segneri: Lenten Sermons............ 355, 520
Short: The Last Gladiatorial Show......... 355
Silverbeach Library.............. 700
Sin.............. 578
  An offense against God—evil in itself.... 579
  The purpose of the agent.............. 580
  Cannot shun responsibility by abiding in darkness.............. 583
  Nothing but righteousness can save character.............. 584
Smiles: Round the World.............. 180
Smith, Philip: Ancient History of the East. 354
Smith, W. C.: Pillars in the Temple....... 355
Southern Review.............. Page 649
Spencer: First Principles.............. 5, 414
  —— Principles of Biology.............. 5, 414
  —— Psychology.............. 5, 414
Stanley, A. P.: Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland.............. 531
Stanley, E. S.: Supply and Qualifications for the Ministry.............. 246
Sterling: As Regards Protoplasm........ 5, 414
Stickney: Autobiography of Amos Kendall. 697
Stowe: My Wife and I.............. 180
Stretton: Bede's Charity.............. 356
Stuart: Critical History and Defense of the Old Testament Canon.............. 674
Sunberry Dale Library.............. 700

Talmage, Sermons by.............. 676
Taylor: Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration, and Adventure.............. 525
Theological Medium, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly.............. 127, 307, 641
Theologische Studien und Kritiken. 148, 501, 624
Townsend: God-Man.............. 311
  —— The Sword and Garment.............. 316
Twenty Years Ago.............. 324
Tyerman: Life and Times of Rev. J. Wesley 334
Tyndall: Fragments of Science..... 5, 154, 414
  —— Heat considered as a Mode of Motion. 5, 414

Ueberweg (Transl. by Morris, with additions by Porter): History of Philosophy.. 164
Universalist Quarterly.............. 307, 641
Upham: Christ in the Soul.............. 333

Vail: Ministerial Education in the M. E. Ch. 246

Warren: Supply and Qualifications for the Ministry.............. 246
Wesley: Address to the Clergy.............. 246
Wesleyan Chapel Committee, Manchester, England, Report of.............. 266
Westminster Review.......... 141, 307, 491, 650
West: The State of the Dead.............. 154
Whateley: Among the Huts in Egypt...... 180
Wilkins: Phœnicia and Israel.............. 170
Wilson: Treatise on English Punctuation.. 180
Wythe: Agreement of Silence and Revelation.............. 677

Youmans: The Correlation and Conservation of Forces; a series of Expositions.. 5

Zeitschrift fur die Historische Theologie. 323, 502, 659
Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. 141, 324, 499, 657
Zion's Herald: Contributions and Editorials relative to the proposed Theol. Seminary. 246

1 4581